





Program Environmental Document and Service Development Plan



Socioeconomics Technical

Memorandum

Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program

May 2021

Socioeconomics Technical Memorandum

This page is intentionally blank.

Contents

1	Intro	roduction1			
	1.1	Study A	Approach	1-1	
2	Prog	Program Location and Description			
	2.1	Program Location			
	2.2	Program Description			
		2.2.1	Build Alternative Option 1 (Coachella Terminus)	2-1	
		2.2.2	Build Alternative Option 2 (Indio Terminus)	2-2	
		2.2.3	Build Alternative Option 3 (Indio Terminus with Limited Third Track)	2-2	
	2.3	Constru	uction	2-3	
		2.3.1	Western Section	2-3	
		2.3.2	Eastern Section	2-3	
	2.4	Operati	ion	2-3	
3	Regu	Iatory F	ramework	3-1	
	3.1	Federa	۱	3-1	
		3.1.1	Civil Rights Act of 1964	3-1	
		3.1.2	Federal Railroad Administration	3-1	
		3.1.3	National Environmental Policy Act	3-1	
		3.1.4	Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of		
			1970	3-1	
	3.2	State		3-2	
		3.2.1	California Relocation Assistance Act	3-2	
4	Meth	lethodology			
	4.1	Approa	ch	4-1	
	4.2	Data Sources		4-2	
	4.3	Tier 1/F	Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area	4-3	
5	Exist	ing Con	ditions	5-1	
	5.1	Historic	al and Projected Population	5-1	
		5.1.1	Build Alternative Option 1 (Coachella Terminus)	5-1	
		5.1.2	Build Alternative Option 2 (Indio Terminus)	5-1	
		5.1.3	Build Alternative Option 3 (Indio Terminus with Limited Third Track)	5-2	
	5.2	Employ	/ment	5-2	

5.2	5.2 Employment		
	5.2.1	Build Alternative Option 1 (Coachella Terminus)	5-2
	5.2.2	Build Alternative Option 2 (Indio Terminus)	5-3
	5.2.3	Build Alternative Option 3 (Indio Terminus with Limited Third Track)	5-3
5.3	Comm	unity Facilities	5-4
	5.3.1	Build Alternative Option 1 (Coachella Terminus)	5-4
5.4	Race a	and Ethnicity	5-11
	5.4.1	Build Alternative Option 2 (Indio Terminus)	5-12
	5.4.2	Build Alternative Option 3 (Indio Terminus with Limited Third Track)	5-12
5.5	House	hold Income	5-12
	5.5.1	Build Alternative Option 1 (Coachella Terminus)	5-12
	5.5.2	Build Alternative Option 2 (Indio Terminus)	5-13
	5.5.3	Build Alternative Option 3 (Indio Terminus with Limited Third Track)	5-13
5.6	Povert	y	5-13
	5.6.1	Build Alternative Option 1 (Coachella Terminus)	5-13
	5.6.2	Build Alternative Option 2 (Indio Terminus)	5-14
	5.6.3	Build Alternative Option 3 (Indio Terminus with Limited Third Track)	5-14
5.7	Limited	d English Proficiency	5-14
	5.7.1	Build Alternative Option 1 (Coachella Terminus)	5-14
	5.7.2	Build Alternative Option 2 (Indio Terminus)	5-15
	5.7.3	Build Alternative Option 3 (Indio Terminus with Limited Third Track)	5-15
Envi	ironmen	ital Consequences	6-1
6.1	No Bu	ild Alternative	6-1
6.2	Build A	Alternative Options 1, 2, and 3	6-1
	6.2.1	Land Acquisition, Displacements, and Relocations	6-1
	6.2.2	Economic Effects	6-3
	6.2.3	Disruption to Community Cohesion	6-6
	6.2.4	Improvements to Regional Mobility and Connectivity	6-9
Tior	2 Envir	onmental Review Considerations	7.1
ner			
Refe	erences		8-1

6

7

8

Tables

Table 4-1. Data Sources for the Evaluation of Socioeconomics	4-2
Table 5-1 Community Facilities	5-4

Appendices

Annendix A	Socioeconomics	Conditions	Tables
Appendix A.	SOCIOECONOTIICS	Conditions	I abies

Appendix B. Socioeconomics Conditions Maps

Abbreviations/Acronyms

ACS	American Community Survey
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
EIR	environmental impact report
EIS	environmental impact statement
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration
LAUS	Los Angeles Union Station
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
Program	Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Corridor Service Program
Program Corridor	Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor
RCTC	Riverside County Transportation Commission
ROW	right-of-way
SDP	Service Development Plan
U.S.	United States
Uniform Act	Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970

1 Introduction

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), California Department of Transportation Division of Rail and Mass Transportation, and Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) are proposing the Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program (Program) to establish daily intercity passenger rail service between Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) in Los Angeles County, California and the City of Coachella in Riverside County, California. This socioeconomics technical memorandum evaluates social and economic environmental considerations (population, employment, and income) along the 144-mile Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor (Program Corridor) in support of a programmatic Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The evaluation of potential social and environmental effects resulting from the Program includes:

- Local government services and revenue
- Community cohesion
- Economic benefits resulting from job creation, construction, and operation expenditures
- Induced growth (particularly in the vicinity of representative station area locations)

1.1 Study Approach

This evaluation was prepared pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and will be incorporated into the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluation.

FRA, California Department of Transportation, and RCTC are using a tiered NEPA/CEQA process (e.g., Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR) to complete the environmental review of the Program, under 40 Code of Federal Regulations 1508.28 (titled "Tiering"), CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 (titled "Program EIR"), and Section 15170 (titled "Joint EIS/EIR"). "Tiering" is a staged environmental review process often applied to environmental review for complex transportation projects.

The Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, along with the concurrent preparation of the Service Development Plan (SDP), are the first steps in the tiered environmental review process. Based on the decisions made in the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR and SDP, future site-specific proposals of infrastructure improvements will be evaluated through one or more Tier 2/Project-level environmental clearance processes. A description of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, SDP, and Tier 2/Project-level analysis processes are further discussed below:

- Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR: The Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts of the No Build Alternative and three Build Alternative Options broadly within the Program Corridor. The Program Corridor provides a flexible regional context for the best location of an enhanced passenger rail system while providing opportunities for the Build Alternative Options to account for engineering and environmental constraints. The Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluation addresses broad questions and likely environmental effects within the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for specific environmental resources. The resource-specific study areas generally represent the potential area where rail infrastructure improvements and station facilities could be implemented and constructed but does not represent the precise location or footprint of the improvement or facility.
- SDP: The SDP defines the Program's service mode, estimated ridership to include demand and revenue forecasts, operational strategy, station and access analysis, operating and maintenance costs, required infrastructure improvements and capital programming, and public benefits analysis necessary to implement the proposed intercity passenger rail service. As part of the SDP process, the site-specific infrastructure improvement requirements are being identified, including the number of stations and the general areas/communities in which stations might be located. The SDP infrastructure analysis is being informed by rail operations simulation modeling and would occur parallel to the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluation process.
- Tier 2 Project-Level Analysis: Based on the environmental evaluation conducted in the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR and the site-specific infrastructure improvements identified in the SDP, a Tier 2/Project-level analysis would be required. The Tier 2/Project-level analysis would be a separate environmental review potentially led and funded by an agency other than FRA. In addition, the Tier 2/Project-level analysis process would not automatically follow the Tier 1 process, rather the potential Tier 2 projects would need to be defined based on the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR's broad scope and funding. The Tier 2/Project-level analysis would closely align with the future preliminary engineering process and would analyze site-specific direct and indirect Project-level effects, in addition to any required permits, consultations, or approvals needed for construction.

2 Program Location and Description

2.1 Program Location

The Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analyzes the No Build Alternative and three Build Alternative Options in two geographic sections—a Western Section and an Eastern Section—occurring within existing railroad rights-of-way (ROW). The Program Corridor runs west-to-east, extending up to 144 linear miles from a western terminus at LAUS to an eastern terminus in either the City of Indio or City of Coachella (depending on the Build Alternative Option).

From west to east, the cities traversed by the Build Alternative Options include Los Angeles, Vernon, Bell, Commerce, Montebello, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, Norwalk, La Mirada, Buena Park, Fullerton, Anaheim, Placentia, Yorba Linda, Chino Hills, Corona, Riverside, Grand Terrace, Colton, San Bernardino, Loma Linda, Redlands, Calimesa, Beaumont, Banning, Cabazon, Palm Springs, Cathedral City, Thousand Palms, Rancho Mirage, Palm Desert, Indio (under all Build Alternative Options), and/or Coachella (under Build Alternative Option 1 only). The boundary between Western and Eastern Sections is in the City of Colton, at the intersection of existing railroad lines owned by Union Pacific Railroad and BNSF.

2.2 Program Description

2.2.1 Build Alternative Option 1 (Coachella Terminus)

Build Alternative Option 1 includes a total Program Corridor distance of 144 miles and consists of a Western Section, terminating at LAUS, and an Eastern Section, terminating in the City of Coachella.

Western Section. Under Build Alternative Option 1, existing rail infrastructure would be used in the Western Section of the Program Corridor, and no additional railroad infrastructure improvements would be required. LAUS would serve as the western terminus, while existing stations in the Cities of Fullerton and Riverside would be utilized to support the proposed passenger rail service. No new stations or improvements to existing stations would be required to accommodate the proposed service within the Western Section of the Program Corridor.

Eastern Section. Under Build Alternative Option 1, potential new infrastructure improvements on the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor could include sidings, additional main line track, wayside signals, drainage, grade separation structures, and up to five new stations constructed in the following areas: 1) Loma Linda/Redlands Area (serving the Cities of Loma Linda and Redlands),

2) the Pass Area (serving the communities of Beaumont, Banning, and Cabazon), 3) the Mid Valley (serving the communities of Cathedral City, Thousand Palms, the Agua Caliente Casino area, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Desert), 4) the City of Indio, and 5) the City of Coachella as the eastern terminus of the Program Corridor.

2.2.2 Build Alternative Option 2 (Indio Terminus)

Build Alternative Option 2 includes a total Program Corridor distance of 140.25 miles and consists of a Western Section, terminating at LAUS, and an Eastern Section, terminating at the City of Indio.

Western Section. The Western Section under Build Alternative Option 2 would be the same as that described above under Build Alternative Option 1.

Eastern Section. Under Build Alternative Option 2, potential new infrastructure improvements on the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor could include sidings, additional main line track, wayside signals, drainage, grade separation structures, and up to four new potential stations could be constructed in the following areas: 1) Loma Linda/Redlands Area (serving the Cities of Loma Linda and Redlands), 2) the Pass Area (serving the communities of Beaumont, Banning, and Cabazon), 3) the Mid Valley (serving the communities of Cathedral City, Thousand Palms, the Agua Caliente Casino area, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Desert), and 4) the City of Indio as the eastern terminus of the Program Corridor.

2.2.3 Build Alternative Option 3 (Indio Terminus with Limited Third Track)

Build Alternative Option 3 includes a total Program Corridor distance of 140.25 miles and consists of a Western Section, terminating at LAUS, and an Eastern Section, terminating at the City of Indio.

Western Section. The Western Section under Build Alternative Option 3 would be the same as that described above under Build Alternative Options 1 and 2.

Eastern Section. The Eastern Section under Build Alternative Option 3 would be the same as that described above under Build Alternative Option 2, except for the following changes:

As part of Build Alternative Option 3, additional infrastructure improvements for the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor have been considered. These potential infrastructure improvements include the addition of station tracks and a third main line track. The addition of station tracks would be the same as described under Build Alternative Options 1 and 2; however, the addition of the third main track would be limited under Build Alternative Option 3 when compared with Build Alternative Options 1 and 2. The limited third track under Build Alternative Option 3 would augment the existing

two main tracks along the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor to the proposed Mid Valley Station Area.

2.3 Construction

2.3.1 Western Section

In the Western Section, existing rail infrastructure would be used to accommodate the proposed service, and no additional track improvements would be required to accommodate the proposed service under all Build Alternative Options. LAUS would serve as the western terminus, and existing stations in the Cities of Fullerton and Riverside would be used. No new stations or additions to existing stations would be required to accommodate the proposed service under all Build Alternative Options.

2.3.2 Eastern Section

In the Eastern Section, proposed new infrastructure improvements under all Build Alternative Options could include sidings, additional main line track, wayside signals, drainage, grade-separation structures, and stations to accommodate the proposed service. The Eastern Section would use the existing station in the City of Palm Springs, which is the only existing station in the Eastern Section. Additionally, up to five new potential stations could be constructed in the following areas: 1) Loma Linda/Redlands Area (serving the Cities of Loma Linda and Redlands), 2) the Pass Area (serving the communities of Beaumont, Banning, and Cabazon), 3) the Mid-Valley (serving the communities of Cathedral City, Thousand Palms, the Agua Caliente Casino area, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Desert), 4) the City of Indio (under all Build Alternative Options), and/or 5) the City of Coachella (under Build Alternative Option 1 only).

2.4 Operation

Passenger train frequencies proposed as part of the Program would consist of the addition of two daily round-trip intercity diesel-powered passenger trains operating the entire length of the Program Corridor between Los Angeles and Indio and/or Coachella, with one morning departure and one afternoon departure from each end of the Program Corridor.

Socioeconomics Technical Memorandum

This page is intentionally blank.

3 Regulatory Framework

3.1 Federal

3.1.1 Civil Rights Act of 1964

All relocation services and benefits would be administered without regard to race, color, national origin, or sex in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (Title 42 United States [U.S.] Code Section 2000d, et seq.). Benefits for eligible owners and tenants are determined on an individual basis and explained in detail by an assigned ROW specialist.

3.1.2 Federal Railroad Administration

According to the FRA's *Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts* (64 *Federal Register* 28545, May 26, 1999) Section 10(b)(16) and Section 14(n)(16) (FRA 1999), an "EIS should assess the impacts on both passenger and freight transportation, by all modes, from local, regional, national, and international perspectives. The EIS should include a discussion of both construction period and long-term impacts on vehicular traffic congestion."

3.1.3 National Environmental Policy Act

NEPA requires the federal government use all practicable means to ensure safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings for all Americans (42 U.S. Code 4331(b)(2)). This requires taking into account adverse environmental impacts, such as destruction or disruption of human-made resources, community cohesion, and the availability of public facilities and services.

3.1.4 Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970

The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Act) provides uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, non-profit associations, or farms by federal and federally assisted programs and establishes uniform and equitable land acquisition policies.

The Uniform Act requires the owning agency to notify affected owners of the agency's intent to acquire an interest in their property, including a written offer letter of just compensation that specifically describes those property interests and assigns a ROW specialist to each property owner to assist them with this process. The Uniform Act also provides financial and advisory benefits to displaced individuals to help them relocate their residence or business. Benefits are available to owners and tenants of residential and business properties.

In compliance with the Uniform Act, property owners and tenants would receive relocation assistance and would be compensated. If required, housing of last resort would be used, which may involve payments for replacement housing costs that exceed the maximum amounts allowed under the Uniform Act or other methods of providing comparable decent, safe, and sanitary housing within the financial means of the displaced persons.

3.2 State

3.2.1 California Relocation Assistance Act

The California Relocation Assistance Act includes requirements for just compensation for real property. Owners of private property have federal and state constitutional guarantees that their property would not be taken for public use or damaged unless they first receive just compensation. Just compensation is measured by the fair market value of the acquired property. According to the Code of Civil Procedure Section 1263.320a, "fair market value is considered to be the highest price on the date of valuation that would be agreed to by a seller, being willing to sell, but under no particular or urgent necessity for so doing, nor obliged to sell; and a buyer, being ready, willing and able to buy but under no particular necessity for so doing, each dealing with the other with the full knowledge of all the uses and purposes for which the property is reasonably adaptable and available."

4 Methodology

This methodology identifies the approach, assumptions, and data sources for describing existing conditions for socioeconomics and analyzing environmental consequences of implementing the Build Alternative Options. Effects on socioeconomic conditions and communities are evaluated qualitatively, consistent with a Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluation.

4.1 Approach

Socioeconomic indicators include historic population growth, population projections, employment, community facilities, race and ethnicity, household income, median household income and income below poverty, and limited English proficiency.

- Population demographic data is presented quantitatively for census block groups located partially, or fully, within 0.5 mile on either side of the Program Corridor and is also reported for cities and counties in the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area.
- The Program Corridor traverses 288 census block groups within these counties and cities, including unincorporated areas of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside counties. Because of the number of census block groups that occur within the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area, demographic data presented at the census block group level is portrayed on maps, rather than in tables. Data for counties and cities is presented in the data tables included in Appendix A.

The evaluation of environmental consequences on socioeconomics includes a qualitative assessment of residential, commercial, and other property effects resulting from acquisition; fiscal implications resulting from residential or business migration out of the community or reductions in local government revenues; potential effects on community cohesion; and changes to regional mobility and connectivity. The evaluation of environmental consequences on socioeconomics is organized as follows:

• Potential effects from acquisitions, easements, and displacements (public or private) were evaluated in compliance with the Uniform Act and broadly analyzed on a county-by-county basis. This evaluation did not identify specific properties that would be affected by land acquisition, displacement, or relocation, as construction data is not yet known.

 Regional economic effects that may occur as a result of construction and operation of the Build Alternative Options are evaluated at the scale of the four-county region (Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside counties). Effects on local government services and revenue are analyzed at the scale of cities and counties.

Localized socioeconomic effects, regardless of scale, cannot be quantified until specific Tier 2/Project design details (i.e., construction Project footprint, road crossings, and station locations), construction expenditures, and the details of planned rail operations are known. Therefore, existing socioeconomic conditions within the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area are described quantitatively, while potential effects of the Build Alternative Options can only be described qualitatively in this evaluation. Tier 2/Project-level analysis would address site-specific potential effects resulting from construction and operation of new stations, maintenance facilities, and other infrastructure.

4.2 Data Sources

Social and economic characteristics were gathered from the U.S. Census Bureau, including the 1970 to 2010 decennial U.S. Census and the 2012 to 2016 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates.

Population projections were obtained from the California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit. Population, household income, and employment characteristics were gathered to describe the population demographics of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area. The description of the socioeconomic environment also includes identification of minority, low-income, and limited English proficiency households. The source and scale of economic and demographic data used in this socioeconomic evaluation is summarized in Table 4-1.

Data Description	Data Source	Data Scale
Historic population growth	Decennial Census for 1970, 1980,	State and counties
	1990, 2000, 2010	
Population projections	California Department of Finance,	State and counties
	Demographic Research Unit, Estimated	
	and Projected Population for California	
	and Counties, 2010 to 2060, 1-year	
	increments (released January 2018)	
	(California Department of Finance	
	2018)	

Table 4-1. Data Sources for the Evaluation of Socioeconomics

Socioeconomics Technical Memorandum

Data Description	Data Source	Data Scale
Employment	ACS 2012 to 2016 5-year estimates	State, counties, and cities
Household income	ACS 2012 to 2016 5-year estimates	State, counties, and cities
Race and ethnicity	ACS 2012 to 2016 5-year estimates	State, counties, cities, and census block groups
Median household income and income below poverty	ACS 2012 to 2016 5-year estimates	State, counties, cities, and census block groups
Limited English proficiency	ACS 2012 to 2016 5-year estimates	State, counties, cities, and census block groups

Notes:

ACS=American Community Survey

4.3 Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area

The Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area for this Socioeconomics Technical Memorandum is defined as 0.5 mile centered on the Build Alternative Options' route alternatives (0.25 mile on either side of the railroad centerline). The Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR is divided into Western and Eastern Sections.

Socioeconomics Technical Memorandum

This page is intentionally blank.

5 Existing Conditions

5.1 Historical and Projected Population

5.1.1 Build Alternative Option 1 (Coachella Terminus)

Between 1970 and 2010, the four-county region of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties (which corresponds to the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area) grew by more than 7.4 million people. In 2010, the region was home to approximately 46.0 percent of the population in California. Los Angeles County has the largest population in the four-county region, followed by Orange County. Historical growth patterns between 1970 and 2010 show that Riverside and San Bernardino counties grew at a faster rate than Los Angeles and Orange counties. Riverside County and San Bernardino County grew at an average annual rate of 4.0 percent and 2.8 percent, respectively, while Los Angeles County and Orange County grew annually by 0.8 percent and 1.9 percent, respectively (Table A-1 in Appendix A).

Population projections prepared by the California Department of Finance forecast that the population within the four-county region will continue to grow between 2018 and 2050; however, the annual growth rate is anticipated to slow to 0.5 percent annually for the four-county region as a whole with higher annual growth rates forecast for San Bernardino County (1 percent) and Riverside County (1.1 percent) compared with Los Angeles County (0.3 percent) and Orange County (0.4 percent), consistent with historical trends (Table A-2 in Appendix A).

The four-county region is projected to grow approximately 17.0 percent overall between 2018 and 2050, for a total population of approximately 21.3 million people in 2050. By then, the four-county region will account for approximately 43.0 percent of the state population. These growth forecasts suggest that the Program Corridor between Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties will support a substantial portion of the state's population in 2050.

5.1.2 Build Alternative Option 2 (Indio Terminus)

Existing and projected population data and trends within Build Alternative Option 2 are the same as Build Alternative Option 1.

5.1.3 Build Alternative Option 3 (Indio Terminus with Limited Third Track)

Existing and projected population data and trends within Build Alternative Option 3 are the same as Build Alternative Option 1.

5.2 Employment

5.2.1 Build Alternative Option 1 (Coachella Terminus)

According to ACS 2012 to 2016 5-year estimates, in the four-county region, education, health care, and social services account for the largest employment sector, followed by professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services, and then retail.

Most of the economies outside the larger urban centers also follow the regional trends. The education, health care, and social services sector is the leading employment division in almost all the counties and cities within the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area. The smallest employment sectors in the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area include agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting and mining; information; wholesale trade; and public administration.

Relative to other communities along the Program Corridor, the cities of Vernon and Indio are two exceptions from the general trends, as detailed below:

- The City of Vernon is an industrial city of 5.2 square miles located several miles southeast of downtown Los Angeles. The City of Vernon is home to more than 1,800 businesses that employ approximately 55,000 people (City of Vernon 2018). However, most employees are non-resident, as evidenced by the fact that the employed civilian labor force in Vernon was estimated at only 57 individuals in the ACS 2012 to 2016 5-year estimates. Approximately 47.0 percent of those individuals are employed in finance, insurance, real estate, and rental and leasing.
- The City of Indio has been one of Southern California's most important agricultural regions, with a history of date cultivation, and currently produces 41.4 million pounds of dates annually (City of Indio 2018). Historically, many residents were employed by the agricultural industry; however, development related to residential uses, recreation, tourism, and hospitality has begun to displace agriculture in the region today. Per the ACS 2012 to 2016 5-year estimates, the primary employment sector in Indio is arts, entertainment, recreation, and accommodation and food services, accounting for 19.9 percent of civilian employment.

Agriculture remains an important employment sector in Coachella, with 11.3 percent of civilian employment attributed to agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining.

 In the City of Coachella, agriculture remains an important employment sector, with 11.3 percent of civilian employment attributed to agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining.

Healthcare employers in Los Angeles County and Orange County include multiple healthcare systems (e.g., Kaiser Permanente and Los Angeles Health System), numerous regional and local hospitals, and medical facilities. Employers in the educational sector include the University of California, California State University, as well as local school districts. Major employers in entertainment services (Walt Disney Company), and transportation services (e.g., Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Southern California Regional Rail Authority, and Orange County Transportation Authority).

Major employers in San Bernardino County and Riverside County of the Eastern Section include transportation services (e.g., Southern California Regional Rail Authority, Omnitrans Public Transit Agency, Riverside Transit Agency, Ontario International Airport, and Palm Springs International Airport), warehousing and logistics services (e.g., Amazon, Ross, ALDI, Harbor Freight, and Lowes), and entertainment services (Morongo Casino, Resort and Spa; Spotlight 29 Casino; and Fantasy Springs Resort Casino).

ACS 2012 to 2016 5-year estimates report an unemployment rate of 8.7 percent in California and an average of 9.0 percent in the four-county Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area (Table A-3 in Appendix A). The percent of the civilian labor force that is unemployed is higher than the four-county average of 9.0 percent in 12 of the 27 cities in the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area. Coachella, San Bernardino, and Banning have the highest unemployment rates at 17.2, 14.1, and 14.0 percent, respectively.

5.2.2 Build Alternative Option 2 (Indio Terminus)

Existing and projected employment data and trends within Build Alternative Option 2 are the same as Build Alternative Option 1.

5.2.3 Build Alternative Option 3 (Indio Terminus with Limited Third Track)

Existing and projected employment data and trends within Build Alternative Option 3 are the same as Build Alternative Option 1.

5.3 Community Facilities

5.3.1 Build Alternative Option 1 (Coachella Terminus)

Community facilities include city halls, community centers, schools, libraries, places of worship, healthcare facilities, police and fire stations, and veteran services (Table 5-1). Community facilities occur throughout the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area, as depicted on Figure B-1, Community Facilities in Appendix B. See Section 3.13, Parklands and Community Services of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, for an evaluation of parks in the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area.

Type of Facility	Name of Facility	City			
Western Section					
Community Center	Fullerton Community Center	Fullerton			
Community Center	Ysmael Villegas Community Center	Riverside			
Fire Station	Los Angeles County Fire Department Station 25	Pico Rivera			
Fire Station	Santa Fe Springs Fire Dept. Station #1	Santa Fe Springs			
Fire Station	Orange County Fire Authority Station #35	Placentia			
Fire Station	Orange County Fire Authority Station #53	Yorba Linda			
Fire Station	Corona City Fire Station # 2	Corona			
Fire Station	Riverside City Fire Station # 1	Riverside			
Fire Station	Riverside City Fire Station # 12	Riverside			
Fire Station	Riverside City Fire Station # 3	Riverside			
Healthcare Facilities	Department of State Hospitals - Metropolitan	Norwalk			
Healthcare Facilities	Corona Summit Surgical Center	Corona			
Healthcare Facilities	Kaiser Permanente Riverside Medical Center	Riverside			
Healthcare Facilities	Riverside Medical Clinic Surgery Center	Riverside			

Table 5-1 Community Facilities

Type of Facility	Name of Facility	City
Law Enforcement	Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Twin Towers Correctional Facility	Los Angeles
Law Enforcement	Los Angeles County Sherriff Transportation Bureau	Los Angeles
Law Enforcement	Fullerton Police Department	Fullerton
Law Enforcement	Placentia Police Department	Placentia
Law Enforcement	Corona Police Department	Corona
Library	Rivera Library	Pico Rivera
Library	Fullerton Public Library	Fullerton
Library	Hunt Branch	Fullerton
Library	Placentia Library District	Placentia
Place of Worship	Nishi Hongwanji Buddhist Temple	Los Angeles
Place of Worship	Church of Scientology International	Commerce
Place of Worship	Rivera First Baptist Church	Pico Rivera
Place of Worship	St Bartholomew's Episcopal Church	Pico Rivera
Place of Worship	St Mariana De Paredes Catholic Church	Pico Rivera
Place of Worship	One Life Presbyterian Church	Buena Park
Place of Worship	Epic Church	Fullerton
Place of Worship	First Lutheran Church-Fullerton	Fullerton
Place of Worship	Fullerton First United Methodist Church	Fullerton
Place of Worship	GMI Living Stones	Fullerton
Place of Worship	Grace Ministries International	Fullerton
Place of Worship	Grace Ministries International - Korean Church	Fullerton
Place of Worship	Ina Mega Church	Fullerton

Type of Facility	Name of Facility	City
Place of Worship	Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses	Fullerton
Place of Worship	Praise Chapel of Buena Park	Fullerton
Place of Worship	Saint Mary Church	Fullerton
Place of Worship	The Fullerton Church	Fullerton
Place of Worship	United Pentecostal Church - Pentecostal Church	Fullerton
Place of Worship	Wilshire Avenue Community Church	Fullerton
Place of Worship	Calvary Chapel East Anaheim	Anaheim
Place of Worship	Church of the Nazarene	Placentia
Place of Worship	Orange Central Korean Seventh Day Adventists	Placentia
Place of Worship	Calvary Chapel The Way	Yorba Linda
Place of Worship	Canyon Hills Friends Church	Yorba Linda
Place of Worship	Community Christian Church	Yorba Linda
Place of Worship	Grace Lutheran Church	Yorba Linda
Place of Worship	Grace Presbyterian Church	Yorba Linda
Place of Worship	Santa Clara de Asis Catholic Church	Yorba Linda
Place of Worship	Corona Spanish Seventh-Day	Corona
Place of Worship	Corpus Christi Catholic Church	Corona
Place of Worship	Living Water Church	Corona
Place of Worship	New Life Community Church	Corona
Place of Worship	Orthodox Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary	Corona
Place of Worship	The Rock Corona	Corona
Place of Worship	Antioch Missionary Baptist Church	Riverside
Place of Worship	Fellowship Baptist Church	Riverside

Type of Facility	Name of Facility	City
Place of Worship	Grace Bible Church	Riverside
Place of Worship	Highgrove United Methodist Church	Riverside
Place of Worship	Mark A Thomas Ministries	Riverside
Place of Worship	Our Lady of Guadalupe Shrine	Riverside
Place of Worship	Our Lady of Perpetual Help Church	Riverside
Place of Worship	Saint Anthony Catholic Church	Riverside
Place of Worship	Second Baptist Church	Riverside
Place of Worship	SGI-USA Riverside Buddhist Center	Riverside
Place of Worship	St Francis De Sales Catholic Church	Riverside
Place of Worship	The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints	Riverside
Place of Worship	The Universal Church	Riverside
Place of Worship	Foursquare Church of Colton	Colton
Place of Worship	Iglesia Bautista Hispana Rayos de Luz	Colton
Place of Worship	San Salvador Church	Colton
Place of Worship	The Door Church Colton	Colton
School - College	Grace Mission University	Fullerton
School - College	Brightwood College Riverside	Riverside
School - Private	Saint Marianne de Paredes School	Pico Rivera
School - Private	Eastside Christian	Fullerton
School - Private	Saint Mary's School	Fullerton
School - Private	IvyCrest Montessori Private School	Yorba Linda
School - Private	St Francis of Assisi Catholic School	Yorba Linda
School - Private	Montessori Academy	Riverside

Type of Facility	Name of Facility	City
School - Private	Riverside Montessori Academy	Riverside
School - Private	St Francis de Sales Preschool	Riverside
School - Private	Woodcrest Christian Day School	Riverside
School - Public	Ann Street Elementary	Los Angeles
School - Public	Endeavor College Preparatory Charter School	Los Angeles
School - Public	Felicitas and Gonzalo Mendez High	Los Angeles
School - Public	Montessori of Yorba Linda	Pico Rivera
School - Public	Los Nietos Middle School	Whittier
School - Public	Pioneer High School	Whittier
School - Public	Hargitt Middle School	Norwalk
School - Public	John H Glenn High School	Norwalk
School - Public	Southeast Academy High School	Norwalk
School - Public	Anthony School	La Mirada
School - Public	Rancho School	La Mirada
School - Public	Commonwealth Elementary School	Fullerton
School - Public	Maple Elementary School	Fullerton
School - Public	Pacific Drive Elementary School	Fullerton
School - Public	Esperanza High School	Anaheim
School - Public	Glenview Elementary	Anaheim
School - Public	Woodsboro Elementary	Anaheim
School - Public	El Camino Real Continuation High School	Placentia
School - Public	Alvord Continuation High School	Riverside
School - Public	Arlington High School	Riverside

Type of Facility	Name of Facility	City	
School - Public	Casa Blanca School	Riverside	
School - Public	Villegas Middle School	Riverside	
School - Public	Garfield School	Colton	
School - Public	San Salvador Preschool	Colton	
School - Public	Woodrow Wilson Elementary School	Colton	
Eastern Section			
City Hall	Banning City Hall	Banning	
City Hall	Indio City Hall	Indio	
City Hall	Coachella City Hall	Coachella	
Fire Station	Beaumont Fire Department	Beaumont	
Fire Station	Beaumont Fire Station	Beaumont	
Fire Station	Banning City Fire Station 89	Banning	
Healthcare Facilities	Jerry L. Pettis Memorial Veterans Hospital	Loma Linda	
Healthcare Facilities	San Gorgonio Pass Memorial Hospital	Banning	
Law Enforcement	California Highway Patrol	Beaumont	
Law Enforcement	Banning Police Department	Banning	
Law Enforcement	Cabazon Station	Cabazon	
Law Enforcement	Riverside County Sheriff-Patrol	Cabazon	
Law Enforcement	California Highway Patrol	Indio	
Library	Indio Library	Indio	
Library	Coachella Branch Library	Coachella	
Place of Worship	The Rock Church and World Outreach Center	San Bernardino	
Place of Worship	Loma Linda Romanian Church	Loma Linda	

Type of Facility	Name of Facility	City
Place of Worship	Loma Linda Seventh-Day Adventists Chinese Church	Loma Linda
Place of Worship	Campus Hill Church of Seventh-Day Adventists	Loma Linda
Place of Worship	St John Christian Community Church	Beaumont
Place of Worship	Canaan Church Banning	Banning
Place of Worship	Faith Builders Family Church	Banning
Place of Worship	United Methodist Church	Banning
Place of Worship	Cabazon Community Church	Cabazon
Place of Worship	Cabazon Foursquare Church	Cabazon
Place of Worship	Cornerstone Covenant Church	Palm Desert
Place of Worship	Rock Church	Palm Desert
Place of Worship	Quiet Times Ministries	Bermuda Dunes
Place of Worship	New Seasons Church	Indio
Place of Worship	Islamic Society of Coachella	Coachella
School - College	Loma Linda University	Loma Linda
School - Private	The Rock Christian School	San Bernardino
School - Private	Desert Christian Academy	Bermuda Dunes
School - Public	Highland Academy Charter School	Beaumont
School - Public	Herbert Hoover Elementary School	Indio
School - Public	Cesar Chavez Elementary	Coachella
School - Public	Coachella Valley Adult School	Coachella
Veterans Services	Veterans Services - Banning (DPSS Office)	Banning
Veterans Services	Riverside County Veteran's Services	Indio

5.4 Race and Ethnicity

The U.S. Census Bureau reports race and ethnicity as two separate categories. An individual can identify their race as White, Black or African American, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Some Other Race, or Two or More Races. Ethnicity is defined as whether a person is of Hispanic origin or not. Ethnicity, therefore, is broken out in two categories: Hispanic or Latino and Not Hispanic or Latino. Individuals identifying as Hispanic may be of any race.

According to the 2012 to 2016 ACS 5-year estimates, California was home to approximately 38.7 million people. Of the total population, approximately 14.9 million people (or 38.6 percent) are of Hispanic or Latino ethnicity. The remaining 23.8 million are of non-Hispanic or Latino origin. Of the state's non-Hispanic or Latino population, the greatest number of people identified their race as White, followed by Asian, and Black or African American. Those identifying as American Indian and Alaska Native or Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander make up the smallest racial categories in the state, totaling less than 1 percent each of the entire population (Table A-4 in Appendix A).

The racial composition trends in the four-county Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties) follow those of the state. The greatest proportion of individuals identify their race as White, followed by Asian, and Black or African American. However, a greater percent of the population identify as Hispanic or Latino in the four-county region (46.1 percent) compared with the state (38.6 percent). San Bernardino County has the largest Hispanic or Latino population, accounting for 51.7 percent of the county's total population. Orange County has the smallest Hispanic or Latino population, estimated at 34.2 percent of its population.

Several communities in the four-county Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area have a larger share of minority populations when compared with the region. Commerce, Bell, and Pico Rivera are all predominantly Hispanic, with greater than 90 percent of their population descending from Hispanic or Latino ethnicity. The City of Banning in Riverside County has the highest proportion of American Indian and Alaska Native individuals, totaling almost 2.4 percent of its population. The Morongo Indian Reservation, consisting mainly of the Cahuilla and Serrano tribal groups, is located northeast of the City of Banning. Refer to Table A-4 in Appendix A for additional information on race and ethnicity in the counties and cities within the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR and Figures B-2 and B-3 in Appendix B for the location of minority populations in and around the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area.

5.4.1 Build Alternative Option 2 (Indio Terminus)

Existing community facility information and data within Build Alternative Option 2 are the same as Build Alternative Option 1.

5.4.2 Build Alternative Option 3 (Indio Terminus with Limited Third Track)

Existing community facility information and data within Build Alternative Option 3 are the same as Build Alternative Option 1.

5.5 Household Income

5.5.1 Build Alternative Option 1 (Coachella Terminus)

Income is defined as income received on a regular basis (exclusive of certain money receipts such as capital gains) before payments for personal income taxes, social security, union dues, or Medicare deductions (U.S. Census Bureau 2018). Income does not reflect the fact that some individuals receive part of their income in the form of noncash benefits, such as food stamps or health benefits, and it also does not reflect noncash benefits such as the use of business transportation. Median household income is the number that divides the income distribution into two equal halves; one half having income above that amount, and the other half having income below that amount.

ACS 2012 to 2016 5-year estimates report the median household income for the State of California to be \$63,783. In the four-county Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area, the median household income ranged from a high of \$78,145 in Orange County, to a low of \$54,469 in San Bernardino County (Table A-5 in Appendix A). Several communities had higher median household incomes compared with the four-county Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area, including Yorba Linda (\$119,697), La Mirada (\$81,956), and Placentia (\$80,668). Communities in the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area with the lowest median household income include Vernon (\$38,333), Bell (\$38,823), San Bernardino (\$38,456), and Coachella (\$36,124). Table A-5 in Appendix A provides a breakdown of households per income bracket and median household income for the counties and cities in the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area. Figure B-4 in Appendix B shows median household incomes within census block groups in the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area.

5.5.2 Build Alternative Option 2 (Indio Terminus)

Existing household income information and data within Build Alternative Option 2 are the same as Build Alternative Option 1.

5.5.3 Build Alternative Option 3 (Indio Terminus with Limited Third Track)

Existing household income information and data within Build Alternative Option 3 are the same as Build Alternative Option 1.

5.6 Poverty

The U.S. Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by family size and makeup to determine the percent of families in poverty. If a family's total income is less than the poverty threshold, then that family is considered in poverty. Poverty thresholds do not vary geographically but are updated for inflation using the Consumer Price Index. The official poverty definition uses pre-tax income (not including capital gains or non-cash benefits).

5.6.1 Build Alternative Option 1 (Coachella Terminus)

Statewide, 11.8 percent of families were estimated to have incomes below the poverty level, as reported in the ACS 2012 to 2016 5-year estimates. Within the four-county region, family poverty rates for three of the four counties were higher than the state average, including Los Angeles County (13.9 percent), Riverside County (12.8 percent), and San Bernardino County (15.4 percent). The family poverty rate in Orange County is lower than the state average at 8.7 percent (Table A-6 in Appendix A).

Communities in the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area with the highest percentage of families in poverty include Vernon (46.7 percent), San Bernardino (28.1 percent), and Coachella (26.6 percent). Five of the six incorporated cities located in Riverside County in the Eastern Section have poverty rates exceeding 12.8 percent, which is the average poverty rate for Riverside County. Two of the five incorporated cities located in San Bernardino County in the Eastern Section have poverty rates that exceed 15.4 percent, which is the average poverty rate for Riverside County (California State Data Center 2016a). Refer to Table A-6 in Appendix A for additional information on poverty rates within the counties and cities in the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area and Figure B-5 in Appendix B for additional information on families with incomes below poverty in, and around, the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area.

5.6.2 Build Alternative Option 2 (Indio Terminus)

Existing poverty information and data within Build Alternative Option 2 are the same as Build Alternative Option 1.

5.6.3 Build Alternative Option 3 (Indio Terminus with Limited Third Track)

Existing poverty information and data within Build Alternative Option 3 are the same as Build Alternative Option 1.

5.7 Limited English Proficiency

Limited English proficiency is characterized in terms of a U.S. Census respondent's ability to speak English. U.S. Census respondents who reported speaking a language other than English are then asked to indicate their English-speaking ability based on one of the following categories: "Very well," "Well," "Not well," or "Not at all." Those who answered "Well," "Not well," or "Not at all" are reported as "Speaking English 'Less than Very Well.'"

5.7.1 Build Alternative Option 1 (Coachella Terminus)

In the four-county Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area, the percent of the population age 5 and over that speak English "Less than Very Well" is highest for Los Angeles County (24.9 percent), followed by Orange County (20.2 percent), San Bernardino County (15.7 percent), and Riverside County (15.0 percent). Cities in the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area with the highest rates of limited English proficiency include Coachella (47.1 percent), Bell (41.0 percent), Buena Park (32.7 percent), and Commerce (31.5 percent) (California State Data Center 2016b). Refer to Table A-7 in Appendix A for additional information on rates of limited English proficiency within the counties and cities in the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area, and Figure B-6 in Appendix B for additional information on populations with limited English proficiency in and around the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area.

5.7.2 Build Alternative Option 2 (Indio Terminus)

Existing limited English proficiency information and data within Build Alternative Option 2 are the same as Build Alternative Option 1.

5.7.3 Build Alternative Option 3 (Indio Terminus with Limited Third Track)

Existing limited English proficiency information and data within Build Alternative Option 3 are the same as Build Alternative Option 1.

Socioeconomics Technical Memorandum

This page is intentionally blank.

6 Environmental Consequences

6.1 No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, the proposed passenger rail service and associated infrastructure would not be implemented in the Program Corridor. The counties and cities in the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR would continue to grow, which would increase regional transportation demand.

Economic activity within the four-county Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area is dependent on adequate transportation infrastructure for localized and regional economic growth potential. Under the No Build Alternative, the economies of these communities would experience reduced transportation capacity, thereby affecting socioeconomic conditions. The No Build Alternative would also forego the short-term and long-term job creation that is anticipated to occur under the Build Alternative Options. However, potential community disruption resulting from implementation of new stations would be avoided.

6.2 Build Alternative Options 1, 2, and 3

6.2.1 Land Acquisition, Displacements, and Relocations

Western Section

Construction and Operation

The majority of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area in the Western Section is densely developed with industrial or commercial businesses and residences located in close proximity to the existing railroad ROW. The Western Section utilizes existing rail infrastructure, and no additional track improvements would be required to accommodate the proposed service. No new stations or improvements to existing stations would be required to accommodate the proposed service service. As such, property acquisitions as a result of proposed construction or operation are not anticipated under any of the Build Alternative Options.

Operation of the Build Alternative Options in the Western Section of the Program Corridor is not anticipated to cause long-term disruptions to residences and businesses located near the existing railroad ROW. In addition, operation of the Program in the Western Section of the Program Corridor would not require land acquisitions or result in displacements or relocations, as the existing railroad infrastructure and stations would be utilized. Therefore, substantial residential or business migration out of the community or substantial reductions in revenue sources for local governments because of property tax or sales and use tax losses is not anticipated under any of the Build Alternative Options.

Eastern Section

Construction and Operation

The density of development is generally lower in the Eastern Section between Colton in San Bernardino County and Coachella in Riverside County. The Program Corridor traverses areas comprised of residential and commercial land uses, as well as large segments of undeveloped and/or agricultural uses. Infrastructure improvements and new stations planned for the Eastern Section to implement the proposed new service of two daily round-trip intercity passenger trains would likely result in land acquisition; however, because the density of development is generally low in the Eastern Section, acquisitions could potentially avoid residential and business displacement.

If construction of new infrastructure or stations requires property outside of the existing railroad ROW, residences, businesses, or community facilities could be displaced. Because the Program utilizes an existing rail corridor, land acquisition for improvements for sidings, additional main line track, wayside signals, drainage, and grade-separation structures is anticipated to occur primarily within the ROW or consist of sliver acquisitions adjacent to existing track. Land acquisitions for new passenger rail stations could be more extensive, depending on final siting of station locations. If construction of new rail infrastructure or stations requires property outside of the existing railroad ROW, residences, businesses, or community facilities could be displaced. Site-specific effects related to potential land acquisition, displacements, and relocations would be considered at the Tier 2/Project-level analysis.

The provisions of the Uniform Act would apply to all acquisitions of real property or displacements of persons resulting from the Program. Because the Uniform Act requires the owning agency to notify affected owners of the agency's intent to acquire an interest in their property, this process would occur prior to construction with services of a ROW specialist assigned to each property owner to assist him or her through the acquisition process. The Uniform Act also provides benefits to displaced individuals to assist them financially and with advisory services related to relocating their residence or business operation. Benefits are available to both owner occupants and tenants of either residential or business properties.

During operation, passenger train frequencies proposed as part of the Program would consist of the addition of two daily, round-trip intercity diesel-powered passenger trains operating between Los Angeles and Coachella. Socioeconomic and community effects are expected to be both positive and negative within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. In terms of negative socioeconomic and community effects, land acquisition for the Build Alternative Options could result in property tax
revenue losses for local jurisdictions if residential or business properties are removed from the property tax assessment roll. Community effects could include disruptions to local communities and may require displacements or relocations of residences and businesses. Site-specific effects related to potential land acquisitions, displacements, or relocations and property or sales and use tax losses would be identified and evaluated during the Tier 2/Project-level analysis.

6.2.2 Economic Effects

Job Creation

Western Section

CONSTRUCTION

The Western Section utilizes existing rail infrastructure, and no additional track improvements would be required to accommodate the proposed service. No new stations or construction to existing stations would be required to accommodate the proposed service. As such, effects related to job creation are not anticipated. When compared with the No Build Alternative, effects on job creation would be negligible within the Western Section under Build Alternatives Options 1, 2, and 3.

OPERATION

Long-term operation and maintenance of the additional two daily round-trip intercity passenger trains associated with the Program would result in the creation of direct jobs, as well as additional indirect and induced jobs. The majority of permanent jobs resulting from long-term operation and maintenance of the Build Alternative Options would be jobs related to train operations, dispatching, maintenance of equipment, and maintenance of infrastructure. In the long term, the Build Alternative Options are also expected to result in indirect job creation because of improvements to accessibility and land use changes in areas surrounding stations. For example, improvements in accessibility can result in long-term dynamic economic effects, such as enhanced labor market accessibility, increased business travel and transactions, direct transport cost savings, improved business and worker productivity, and support of tourism and other important service sectors requiring patron accessibility. Because infrastructure improvements are unknown as this time, quantitative effects related to potential long-term job creation would be considered at the Tier 2/Project-level analysis.

Long-term socioeconomic benefits associated with the Program would be realized within the counties and cities that the Program Corridor crosses. Enhanced passenger rail service within the Program Corridor would provide additional connections to major economic generators within the Program Corridor, including the Cities of Los Angeles, Fullerton, Riverside, and Palm Springs. The

improved access would likely result in increased economic activity within cities directly served by the passenger rail, particularly near stations.

Improved access within the region and affected cities is anticipated to have social benefits including better access to jobs, community amenities, and facilities. Improving regional mobility and connections between economic and employment centers, education centers, other cultural and recreational activity centers, and to shops and services adjacent to station areas would enhance socioeconomic conditions throughout the region.

Eastern Section

CONSTRUCTION

Construction of the Build Alternative Options would stimulate short-term employment and is projected to create additional direct, indirect, and induced jobs in the four affected counties. The largest job growth is expected to be temporary in the construction industry. The next most heavily affected industry would likely be the retail trade sector due in large part to spending on goods and services by the temporary construction workforce and permanent rail employees. Because infrastructure improvements are unknown as this time, quantitative effects related to potential short-term job creation would be considered at the Tier 2/Project-level analysis.

OPERATION

Changes to job creation within the Eastern Section, as a result of operations associated with the Program, would be similar to that described under the Western Section.

Property or Sales and Use Tax Losses

Western Section

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION

The majority of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area in the Western Section is densely developed with industrial or commercial businesses and residences located in close proximity to the existing railroad ROW. The Western Section utilizes existing rail infrastructure, and no additional track improvements would be required to accommodate the proposed service. No new stations or construction to existing stations would be required to accommodate the proposed service. As such, effects related to property or sales and use tax losses are not anticipated under any of the Build Alternative Options.

Eastern Section

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION

The potential for land acquisition in the Eastern Section could result in property tax revenue losses for local jurisdictions if residential or business properties are removed from the property tax assessment roll. Property tax losses are calculated based on the assessed value of properties that would be full or partial fee acquisitions. The acquisition of temporary and permanent easements would not result in property tax losses because the landowner would retain fee interest in the land and would continue to pay property tax.

Land acquisitions could also result in sales and use tax revenue losses, if sales and use tax-generating businesses are displaced and relocated outside of their current tax district. Relocation of businesses in the same tax district could result in temporary sales and use tax revenue losses during the time when affected businesses are closed for relocation. Site-specific effects related to potential property or sales and use tax losses would be considered at the Tier 2/Project-level analysis.

Sales Tax Gains

Western Section

CONSTRUCTION

The Western Section utilizes existing rail infrastructure, and no additional track improvements would be required to accommodate the proposed service. No new stations or construction to existing stations would be required to accommodate the proposed service. As such, effects related to sales tax gains are not anticipated under any of the Build Alternative Options.

OPERATION

A permanent increase in sales tax revenues is expected within the counties and cities where the Program would operate. Site-specific effects related to potential sales tax revenues would be considered at the Tier 2/Project-level analysis.

Eastern Section

CONSTRUCTION

A temporary increase in sales tax revenues would be expected within the counties and cities in the Eastern Section where construction could occur along the Program Corridor. This increase would result from the taxable sale of construction equipment and materials. Unless specifically exempted,

all transactions for tangible assets related to the Build Alternative Options would be subject to sales tax. Site-specific effects related to potential sales tax revenues would be considered at the Tier 2/Project-level analysis.

OPERATION

A permanent increase in sales tax revenues is expected within the counties and cities where the Build Alternative Options would operate. Induced transit-oriented development around new station areas could generate economic activity and create new sources of sales tax revenue throughout operations. Site-specific effects related to potential sales tax revenues would be considered at the Tier 2/Project-level analysis.

6.2.3 Disruption to Community Cohesion

Community cohesion refers to the degree of interaction among the individuals, groups, and institutions that make up the community. Community cohesion takes into consideration access and connectivity, community facilities, and local businesses in the surrounding area that provide opportunities for residents to gather and interact.

Construction and operation of the Build Alternative Options could result in changes to community cohesion, if the Build Alternative Options would result in:

- Physical division of an established neighborhood that could isolate one part of a community from another through the physical removal of homes or businesses or construction of physical barriers to social interaction, circulation, and access (the physical division of established communities and disruption to human-made resources is evaluated under a separate cover in the *Land Use and Planning Technical Memorandum* [RCTC and FRA 2021a])
- Physical removal or disruption in access to community facilities or services
- Physical deterioration of communities because of residential migration out of the community, extensive changes to the business environment of the community, or substantial reductions in revenue sources for local governments
- Changes to the overall quality of life in a community or community character because of secondary effects related to, for example, traffic, noise and vibration, ambient air quality, induced population growth, or aesthetic changes

Western Section

Construction

The Western Section utilizes existing rail infrastructure, and no additional track improvements would be required to accommodate the proposed service. No new stations or construction to existing stations would be required to accommodate the proposed service. As such, effects related to disruption of community cohesion are not anticipated under any of the Build Alternative Options.

Operation

Noise and vibration from operation of the Build Alternative Options in the Western Section (two daily round-trip intercity passenger trains) would not be expected to cause long-term disruptions to residences and businesses located in close proximity to the existing railroad ROW. Current (2018) daily rail traffic volumes on the Western Section (as shown in Chapter 2 of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR) vary by segment (RCTC and FRA 2021b). The highest density segment is between Los Angeles and Fullerton and has an average of 86 daily trains, while the lowest density segment is between Fullerton and Atwood and has an average of 43 daily trains. An additional two daily round-trip intercity passenger trains, even when compared with the lowest density segment, would represent a minor increase in train activity compared with current (2018) traffic volume along the existing railroad ROW. In 2024 and 2044, the Program would add the same number of rail operations to higher baseline conditions. Therefore, the Program's effects in 2024 (as shown in Chapter 2 of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR) and 2044 (as shown in Chapter 2 of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR) would be lower than those evaluated under existing conditions for the lowest density segment. The increase in noise and vibration from four one-way passenger trains (one morning and one afternoon departure from each end of the Program Corridor) would be expected to be incremental compared with existing levels of noise and vibration (see Noise and Vibration Technical Memorandum [RCTC and FRA 2021c] for details on existing daily train operations). Additionally, implementation of the Build Alternative Options within the Western Section would not be anticipated to cause substantial disruption to nearby communities.

Eastern Section

Construction

Proposed construction on the Eastern Section (sidings, additional main line track, wayside signals, drainage, grade-separation structures, and stations) may temporarily affect communities along the Program Corridor. Implementation of the Build Alternative Options in the Eastern Section could temporarily alter access to neighborhoods and community facilities adjacent to the existing Program

Corridor. Temporary relocation of public roads or road closures could also occur in isolated locations, causing some local residents, commercial vehicles, and/or emergency service providers to find alternate routes through the Program Corridor. Elevated levels of noise and air emissions from construction vehicles and equipment, traffic detours and vehicle delay, and visual disruption during construction of the Build Alternative Options within the Eastern Section could cause temporary disruptions to communities adjacent to the railroad ROW. Site-specific effects related to potential disruption to community cohesion would be considered at the Tier 2/Project-level analysis.

Residences, businesses, and/or community facilities within the Eastern Section could be displaced as a result of construction of the Build Alternative Options. Unless similar properties can be obtained for relocation, such displacements could result in changes to community character and cohesion and potentially result in job losses. Economic effects are projected to be largely beneficial because of increased construction expenditures and employment, induced spending, and increased sales and use taxes for local governments. Site-specific effects related to potential disruption to community cohesion would be considered at the Tier 2/Project-level analysis.

Operation

The additional two daily round-trip intercity passenger trains associated with the Program would not be expected to alter automobile, pedestrian, and bicycle access to neighborhoods and community facilities adjacent to the existing Program Corridor in the Eastern Section. Site-specific effects related to potential disruption to community cohesion would be further considered at the Tier 2/Project-level analysis.

Although the current design of crossings (i.e., at-grade or grade-separated) could change upon implementation of the Build Alternative Options in the Eastern Section, the Program improvements are not anticipated to divide or isolate portions of the communities in the Program Corridor. Relocation of public roads or road closures could potentially occur in isolated locations, causing some local residents, commercial vehicles, and/or emergency service providers to find alternate routes through the Program Corridor.

Noise and vibration from operation of the Build Alternative Options in the Eastern Section would not be expected to cause long-term disruptions to residences and businesses located in close proximity to the railroad ROW, as only two daily round-trip intercity passenger trains are associated with the proposed service. Current (2018) daily rail traffic volumes on the Eastern Section (as shown in Chapter 2 of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR) average 43 daily trains along the Colton-Coachella segment, consisting of freight and passenger trains (RCTC and FRA 2021b). The addition of two daily round-trip intercity passenger trains would represent a minor increase in train activity compared with current (2018) traffic volume along the existing railroad ROW. In 2024 and 2044, the Program would add the same number of rail operations to higher baseline conditions. Therefore, the Program's effects in 2024 (as shown in Chapter 2, of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR) and 2044 (as shown in Chapter 2 of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR) would be lower than those evaluated under existing conditions and would not result in substantial changes in noise and vibration levels.

6.2.4 Improvements to Regional Mobility and Connectivity

The potential for improvements to regional mobility and connectivity associated with the implementation of the Build Alternative Options would be similar for both the Western and Eastern Sections. As such, the entire Program Corridor is evaluated in the following discussion.

Long-term socioeconomic benefits in the Program Corridor would accrue in the four-county region intersecting the Program Corridor. Passenger rail service within the Program Corridor would provide connections to major economic generators within the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area, including the cities of Los Angeles, Fullerton, Riverside, and Palm Springs. The improved access would likely result in increased economic activity within cities directly served by the passenger rail, particularly near station areas.

Improved access within the region and affected cities is expected to have social benefits including better access to jobs, community amenities, and facilities. Improving regional mobility and connections between economic and employment centers, education centers, other cultural and recreational activity centers and to shops and services adjacent to station areas would enhance socioeconomic conditions throughout the region.

Connecting urban areas and communities by improving access and mobility could expand employment opportunities over the larger geographic area, benefitting both employers (by expanding the labor pool) and employees (by offering more choices regarding where to live and work). The Program could also offer travel time reductions for transit patrons and regional commuters and reduce traffic congestion by shifting trips from the roadway system to the passenger rail system.

Socioeconomics Technical Memorandum

This page is intentionally blank.

7 Tier 2 Environmental Review Considerations

The Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR is a qualitative evaluation that generally identifies the type of socioeconomic effects that could result from construction and operation of the Build Alternative Options. Specific station locations, Tier 2/Project design, and construction methods have not been determined.

Tier 2/Project-level analysis is anticipated to address potential effects resulting from infrastructure improvements (such as sidings, additional main line track, wayside signals, drainage, grade-separation structures, and stations), potential effects of acquisitions, easements, and displacements (public or private), and compliance with the Uniform Act, as amended.

Pending the location of the Tier 2 infrastructure improvements relative to populations and communities within the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area, potential mitigation measures have been developed on a programmatic scale for further consideration in the Tier 2/Project level analysis. These potential measures include mitigations for any potential construction impacts along the Eastern Section Program Corridor that would be triggered as a result of the construction of the proposed infrastructure, station placement, and relocations related to acquisitions, such that effects on populations and communities would be minimized. Implementation of the following mitigations would be decided during the Tier 2/Project-level analysis after exact station location and infrastructure elements are known and would be used prior to and/or during construction, after environmental clearance is complete:

 Construction management plan: Construction management plan would be prepared that includes actions pertaining to visual protection, air quality, safety controls, noise controls, and traffic controls to minimize effects on populations and communities within the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Socioeconomics Study Area. The plan would also verify that property access is maintained for local businesses, residences, and emergency services and would include maintaining customer and vendor access to local businesses throughout construction by using signs to instruct customers about business access during construction. In addition, the plan would include provisions for consultation with local transit providers to minimize effects on local and regional bus routes in affected communities. Relocation mitigation plan: If acquisitions related to the construction of infrastructure improvements (such as sidings, additional main line track, wayside signals, drainage, grade-separation structures, and stations) in the Eastern Section cause displacements, a relocation mitigation plan would be developed in consultation with affected cities and counties and property owners.

The relocation mitigation plan would be designed to meet the following objectives:

- Provide affected property and business owners and tenants a high level of individualized assistance in situations when acquisition is necessary and the property owner desires to relocate the existing use
- Coordinate relocation activities resulting in displacements to provide for all displaced persons and businesses to receive fair and consistent relocation benefits
- Minimize the permanent closure of businesses and non-profit agencies as a result of property acquisition
- Within the limits established by law and regulation, minimize the economic disruption caused to property owners by relocation
- Provide those business owners who require complex permitting with regulatory compliance assistance

The relocation mitigation plan would include the following components:

- A description of the appraisal, acquisition, and relocation process, as well as a description of the activities of the appraisal and relocation specialists
- A means of assigning appraisal and relocation staff to affected property owners, tenants, or other residents on an individual basis
- Individualized assistance to affected property owners, tenants, or other residents in applying for funding and researching areas for relocation
- Identification of a single point of contact for property owners, residents, and tenants with questions about the relocation process
 - This point of contact would also act to address concerns about the relocation process as it applies to the individual situations of property owners, tenants, and other residents

 Land use consistency analysis: a land use consistency analysis shall be conducted to determine consistency with the applicable local jurisdictional general plans or programs. Recommendations shall be identified to avoid or minimize conflicts with sensitive land uses or environmental resources.

Socioeconomics Technical Memorandum

This page is intentionally blank.

8 References

- California Department of Finance. 2018. Tables P-1: and P-2, State and County Projections Dataset: Total Estimated and Projected Population for California and Counties: July 1, 2010 to July 1, 2060 in 1-year Increments.
- California State Data Center. 2016a. 2012-2016 American Community Survey (5-year estimates), Data Extract for Income, Poverty, and Employment Status.
- 2016b. 2012-2016 American Community Survey (5-year estimates), Data Extract for Social Characteristics – Household Type, Grandparents, Veterans, Disability, Nativity, Language.

City of Indio. 2018. City of Indio. Accessed July 11, 2018. http://indio.org/about/history.htm.

City of Vernon. 2018. City of Vernon website. Accessed July 10, 2018. http://cityofvernon.org/.

- Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). 1999. Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts. Section 10(b)(16) and Section 14(n)(16). Accessed July 24, 2018. <u>https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/docs/FRAEnvProcedures_FED_REG_Notic_e.pdf</u>.
- Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) and Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). 2021a. Land Use and Planning Technical Memorandum. Prepared by HDR Engineering, Inc.
- ——— 2021b. Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Project Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (Draft). Prepared by HDR Engineering, Inc.
- ——— 2021c. Noise and Vibration Technical Memorandum. Prepared by HDR Engineering, Inc.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2018. Topics (Income and Poverty). Accessed July 2018. <u>https://www.census.gov/topics/income-poverty/income/about.html.</u>

Socioeconomics Technical Memorandum

This page is intentionally blank.

Appendix A. Socioeconomics Conditions Tables

Socioeconomics Technical Memorandum

This page is intentionally blank.

Table A-1. Historic Growth in the State and Region

						Percent Change	Annual Growth
Geography	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	1970-2010	Rate
Population							
State of California	19,953,134	23,667,902	29,760,021	33,871,648	37,253,956	86.7%	1.6%
Los Angeles County	7,041,980	7,447,238	8,863,164	9,519,338	9,818,605	39.4%	0.8%
Orange County	1,421,233	1,932,921	2,410,556	2,846,289	3,010,232	111.8%	1.9%
San Bernardino County	682,233	895,016	1,48,380	1,709,434	2,035,210	198.3%	2.8%
Riverside County	456,916	663,199	1,170,413	1,545,387	2,189,641	379.2%	4.0%
Four-County Region	9,602,362	10,938,374	12,444,133	15,620,448	17,053,688	77.6%	1.4%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau: 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2010 Census

Geography	2018	2020	2030	2040	2050	Percent Change 2018-2050	Annual Growth Rate
Population							
State of California	39,952,483	40,639,392	43,939,250	46,804,202	49,077,801	22.8%	0.6%
Los Angeles County	10,327,815	10,435,036	10,868,614	11,144,846	11,257,873	9.0%	0.3%
Orange County	3,220,451	3,260,012	3,433,510	3,558,071	3,615,935	12.3%	0.4%
San Bernardino County	2,185,083	2,230,602	2,478,888	2,730,966	2,976,804	36.2%	1.0%
Riverside County	2,425,939	2,500,975	2,857,496	3,159,599	3,400,372	40.2%	1.1%
Four-County Region	18,159,288	18,426,625	19,638,508	20,593,482	21,250,984	17%	0.5%

Table A-2. Projected Population Growth in State and Region

Source: California Department of Finance 2018

Table A-3. Employment in State and Region

Domographia	State			Co	unties							Cities					
Demographic	California	Los Angeles	Orange	Riverside	San Bernardino	Four-County Region	Los Angeles	Vernon	Bell	Commerce	Pico Rivera	Santa Fe Springs	Norwalk	La Mirada	Anaheim	Placentia	
Pop over 16 years	30,565,746	8,036,077	2,497,161	1,782,752	1,598,512	13,914,502	2,097,465	64	26,696	6,011	31,519	8,121	50,472	23,652	181,688	27,458	
In Labor Force	19,391,320	5,173,061	1,645,577	1,071,927	962,592	8,853,157	2,097,465	64	17,236	6,011	31,519	8,121	50,472	23,652	181,688	27,458	
Civilian Labor Force	19,260,868	5,169,884	1,643,655	1,067,758	951,616	8,832,913	2,096,761	64	17,236	5,989	31,519	8,095	50,458	23,631	181,583	27,443	
Employed Civilian Labor	17,577,142	4,709,319	1,532,549	946,798	847,144	8,035,810	1,903,882	57	15,263	5,304	28,815	7,701	46,446	21,996	166,854	25,575	
Unemployed Civilian	1,683,726	460,565	111,106	120,960	104,472	797,103	192,879	7	1,973	685	2,704	394	4,012	1,635	14,729	1,868	
Labor (%)	8.7%	8.9%	6.8%	11.3%	11.0%	9.0%	9.2%	10.9%	11.4%	11.4%	8.6%	4.9%	8.0%	6.9%	8.1%	6.8%	
Armed Forces	130,452	3,177	1,922	4,169	10,976	20,244	704	0	0	22	0	26	14	21	105	15	
Agriculture, Forestry	414,997	23,123	7,897	15,163	6,136	52,319	8,690%	0	130	9	143	54	356	44	670	167	
1	2.4%	0.5%	0.5%	1.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.5%	0%	0.9%	0.2%%	0.5%	0.7%%	0.8%	0.2%	0.4%	0.7%	
Construction	1,055,791	268,351	85,931	81,190	60,592	496,064	115,797	0	876	313	1,516	462	2,786	1,380	12,487	1,741	
	6.0%	5.7%	5.6%	8.6%	7.2%	6.2%	6.1%	0%	5.7%	5.9%	5.3%	6.0%	6.0%	6.3%	7.5%	6.8%	
Manufacturing	1,697,080	476,943	196,945	84,544	80,843	839,275	161,733	6	2,259	859	4,414	1,009	6,101	2,740	22,283	3,644	
	3.7%	10.1%	12.9%	8.9%	9.5%	10.4%	8.5%	10.5%	14.8%	16.2%	15.3%	13.1%	13.1%	12.5%	13.4%	14.2%	
Wholesale Trade	530,690	165,120	55,700	28,962	29,935	279,717	53,472	8	1,033	332	1,933	469	2,795	926	6,967	1,022	
	3.0%	3.5%	3.6%	3.1%	3.5%	3.5%	2.8%	14.0%	6.8%	6.3%	6.7%	6.1%	6.0%	4.2%	4.2%	4.0%	
Retail Trade	1,927,782	501,212	167,061	123,362	111,714	903,349	197,190	1	2,341	665	3,345	625	5,652	2,606	18,569	2,560	
	11.0%	10.6%	10.9%	13.0%	13.2%	11.2%	10.4%	1.8%	15.3%	12.5%	11.6%	8.1%	12.2%	11.8%	11.1%	10.0%	
Transportation,	845,011	256,614	50,600	54,840	71,732	433,786	82,018	3	1,4480	447	2,484	473	3,939	1,453	6,036	914	
Warehousing,2	4.8%	5.4%	3.3%	5.8%	8.5%	5.4%	4.3%	5.3%	9.7%	8.4%	8.6%	6.1%	8.5%	6.6%	3.6%	3.6%	
Information	513,204	209,651	32,760	14,076	11,334	267,821	113,393	3	186	127	546	150	703	323	3,048	636	
	2.3%	4.5%	2.1%	1.5%	1.3%	3.3%	6.0%	5.3%	1.2%	2.4%	1.9%	1.9%	1.5%	1.5%	1.8%	2.5%	
Finance and	1,089,085	292,365	131,547	49,265	40,892	514,069	116,985	27	391	156	1,362	504	2,303	1,419	11,044	1,778	
Insurance3	6.2%	6.2%	8.6%	5.2%	4.8%	6.4%	6.1%	47.4%	2.6%	2.9%	4.7%	6.5%	5.0%	6.5%	6.6%	7.0%	
Professional,	2,297,962	595,169	218,777	96,495	78,922	989,363	268,676	0	1,157	372	2,008	668	3,905	1,682	20,810	2,920	
Scientific4	13.1%	12.6%	14.3%	10.2%	9.3%	12.3%	14.1%	0%	7.6%	7.0%	7.0%	8.7%	8.4\$	7.6%	12.5%	11.4%	
Educational	3,674,888	968,020	292,475	194,615	189,104	1,644,214	369,068	1	2,560	1,002	5,717	1,882	9,334	5,793	29,578	5,512	
Services	20.9%	20.6%	19.1%	20.6%	22.3%	20.5%	19.4%	1.8%	16.8%	18.9%	19.8%	24.4%	20.1%	26.3%	17.7%	21.6%	
Arts,	1,817,155	515,900	166,993	107,924	75,404	866,221	239,935	0	1,412	588	2,693	572	4,444	1,747	22,564	2,693	
Entertainment5	10.3%	11.0%	10.9%	11.4%	8.9%	10.8%	12.6%	0%	9.3%	11.1%	9.3%	7.4%	9.6%	7.9%	13.5%	10.5%	
Other Services	938,247	288,080	83,707	49,963	44,341	466,091	134,523	3	1,047	199	1,589	298	2,391	913	8,513	1,162	
(Except Public Ad)	5.3%	6.1%	5.5%	5.3%	5.2%	5.8%	7.1%	5.3%	391	3.8%	5.5%	3.9%	5.1%	4.2%	5.1%	4.5%	
Public Administration	775,250	148,771	42,156	46,399	46,195	283,521	42,402	5	391	235	1,065	535	1,737	970	4,285	826	
	4.4%	3.2%	2.8%	4.9%	5.5%	3.5%	2.2%	8.8%	2.6%	4.4%	3.7%	6.9%	3.7%	4.4%	2.6%	3.2%	

Demographic	Cities																	
	Yorba Linda	Chino Hills	Corona	Riverside	Colton	Grand Terrace	San Bernardin o	Loma Linda	Redlands	Calimesa	Beaumont	Banning	Palm Springs	Cathedral City	Rancho Mirage	Palm Desert	Indio	Coachella
Pop over 16 years	34,711	41,158	81,888	157,515	24,844	6,417	89,365	11,216	32,269	7,013	18,747	10,876	21,807	24,814	16,592	43,756	39,502	30,812
In Labor Force	34,711	41,158	81,888	157,515	24,844	6,417	89,365	11,216	32,269	3,292	18,747	10,876	21,807	24,814	6,036	23,265	39,502	21,681
Civilian Labor Force	34,690	41,137	81,859	157,424	24,844	6,352	89,284	11,209	32,251	3,292	18,738	10,872	21,796	24,805	6,036	23,247	39,482	21,681
Employed Civilian Labor	32,447	3,8242	75,511	140,141	22,409	5,742	76,729	10,450	29,959	2,851	17,474	9,355	19,445	22,356	5,600	21,480	34,808	17,962
Unemployed Civilian	2,243	2,895	6,348	17,283	2,435	610	12,555	759	2,292	441	1,264	1,517	2,351	2,449	436	1,767	4,674	3,719
Labor%	6.5%	7.0%	7.8%	11.0%	9.8%	9.6%	14.1%	6.8%	7.1%	1.9%	6.7%	14.0%	10.8%	9.9%	7.2%	7.6%	11.8%	17.2%
Armed Forces	21	21	29	91	0	65	81	7	18	0	9	4	11	9	0	18	20	0
Agriculture,	273	83	309	750	80	9	630	89	173	16	176	81	79	89	33	181	811	2,031
Forestry 1	0.8%	0.2%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.6%	1.0%	0.9%	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	0.8%	2.3%	11.3%
Construction	1,568	1,933	5,981	11,456	1,692	399	5,458	160	1,305	375	1,078	707	859	1,823	309	1,169	2,882	1,661
	4.8%	5.1%	7.9%	8.2%	7.6%	6.9%	7.1%	1.5%	4.4%	13.2%	6.2%	7.6%	4.4%	8.2%	5.5%	5.4%	8.3%	9.2%
Manufacturing	4,395	3,913	10,380	15,287	2,600	348	7,141	325	1,795	225	1,514	964	798	543	263	708	1,216	918
	13.5%	10.2%	13.7%	10.9%	11.6%	6.1%	9.3%	3.1%	6.0%	7.9%	8.7%	10.3%	4.1%	2.4%	4.7%	3.3%	3.5%	5.1%
Wholesale Trade	1,513	2,421	2,722	5,415	685	145	2,875	23	701	107	304	222	225	229	123	528	567	342
	4.7%	6.3%	3.6%	3.9%	3.1%	2.5%	3.7%	0.2%	2.3%	3.8%	1.7%	2.4%	1.2%	1.0%	2.2%	2.5%	1.6%	1.9%
Retail Trade	2,985	3,981	9,006	17,693	3,592	1,072	10,076	1,187	3,643	362	2,222	1,542	1,911	3,462	544	2,800	4,519	2,332
	9.2%	10.4%	11.9%	12.6%	16.0%	18.7%	13.1%	11.4%	12.2%	12.7%	12.7%	16.5%	9.8%	15.5%	9.7%	13.0%	13.0%	13.0%
Transportation,	933	2,014	3,973	7,985	1,853	385	7,417	567	1,732	155	1,001	475	736	608	214	653	1,119	515
Warehousing,2	2.9%	5.3%	5.3%	5.7%	8.3%	6.7%	9.7%	5.4%	5.8%	5.4%	5.7%	5.1%	3.8%	2.7%	3.8%	3.0%	3.2%	2.9%
Information	848	554	1,036	2,075	133	73	605	32	334	36	210	65	610	273	130	395	538	246
	2.6%	1.4%	1.4%	1.5%	0.6%	1.3%	0.8%	0.3%	1.1%	1.3%	1.2%	0.7%	3.1%	1.2%	2.3%	1.8%	1.5%	1.4%
Finance and Insurance3	3,415	3,602	5,222	6,681	726	153	3,195	326	1,216	151	605	298	1,278	841	765	1,494	1,825	406
	10.5%	9.4%	6.9%	4.8%	3.2%	2.7%	4.2%	3.1%	4.1%	5.3%	3.5%	3.2%	6.6%	3.8%	13.7%	7.0%	5.2%	2.3%
Professional,	4,181	4,269	7,891	12,796	1,594	326	7,156	751	2,712	338	1,522	693	3,002	3,384	828	2,674	4,402	2,429
Scientific4	12.9%	11.2%	10.5%	9.1%	7.1%	5.7%	9.3%	7.2%	9.1%	11.9%	8.7%	7.4%	15.4%	15.1%	14.8%	12.4%	12.6%	13.5%
Educational	7,396	9,404	13,881	32,606	5,497	1,976	15,958	5,756	11,171	620	5,226	1,885	4,122	4,370	1,334	4,377	6,384	2,329
Services	22.8%	24.6%	18.4%	23.3%	24.5%	34.4%	20.8%	55.1%	37.3%	21.7%	29.9%	20.1%	21.2%	19.5%	23.8%	20.4%	18.3%	13.0%
Arts,	2,541	2,701	6,539	13,801	1,791	309	7,830	485	2,053	204	1,517	1,607	4,115	4,637	557	4,337	6,927	3,496
Entertainment5	7.8%	7.1%	8.7%	9.8%	8.0%	5.4%	10.2%	4.6%	6.9%	7.2%	8.7%	17.2%	21.2%	20.7%	10.3%	20.2%	19.9%	19.5%
Other Services	1,310	1,411	4,019	7,232	1,325	182	4,657	400	1,626	94	867	394	1,202	1,562	285	1,536	2,148	776
(Except Public Ad)	4.0%	3.7%	5.3%	5.2%	5.9%	3.2%	6.1%	3.8%	5.4%	3.3%	5.0%	4.2%	6.2%	7.0%	5.1%	7.2%	6.2%	4.3%

Demographic		Cities																
	Yorba Linda	Chino Hills	Corona	Riverside	Colton	Grand Terrace	San Bernardin o	Loma Linda	Redlands	Calimesa	Beaumont	Banning	Palm Springs	Cathedral City	Rancho Mirage	Palm Desert	Indio	Coachella
Public Administration	1,089 3.4%	1,956 5.1%	4,552 6.0%	6,364 4.5%	841 3.8%	365 6.4%	3,731 4.9	349 3.3%	1,498 5.0%	168 5.9%	1,232 7.1%	422 4.5%	508 2.6%	535 2.4%	195 3.5%	628 2.9%	1,470 4.2%	481 2.7%

Source: ACS 2012-2016, 5-year estimates, Table DP03. Notes: 1 Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting, and Mining; 2 Transportation and Warehousing, and Utilities; 3 Finance and Insurance, and Real Estate and Rental and Leasing; 4 Professional, Scientific, and Management, and Administrative and Waste Management Services; 5 Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation, and Accommodation and Food Services

Table A-4. Race and Ethnicity

Geography STATE		Total Population	Total Minority	Hispanic or Latino (all Races)	White	Black or African American	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
STATE											
California	Total %	38,654,206	22,618,701 58.5	1,490,3982 38.6	14,837,2 42 38.4	2,158,363 5.6	136,582 0.4	5,280,818 13.7	138,956 0.4	90,413 0.2	1,107,850 2.9
COUNTY											
Los Angeles	Total %	10,057,155	7,119,139 70.8	4,861,648 48.3	2,687,78 7	801,182 8.0	18,765 0.2	1,413,105 14.1	24,439 0.2	29,351 0.3	220,878 2.2
Orange	Total %	3,132,211	1,730,844 55.3	1,070,553 34.2	1,314,67 2	47,971 1.5	6,475 0.2	596,998 19.1	8,847 0.3	5,903 0.2	80,792 2.6
Riverside	Total %	2,323,892	1,395,524 60.1	1,102,968 47.5	865,631 37.2	137,779 5.9	9,407 0.4	139,108 6.0	6,262 0.3	3,749 0.2	58,988 2.5
San Bernardino	Total %	2,106,754	1,411,439 67.0	1,089,104 51.7	642,786 30.5	170,376 8.1	6,840 0.3	138,751 6.6	6,368 0.3	4,417 0.2	48,112 2.3
Four-County Region	Total %	17,620,012	11,656,946 66.2	8,124,273 46.1	5,510,87 6	1,157,308 6.6	41,487 0.2	2,287,962 13.0	45,916 0.3	43,420 0.2	408,770 2.3
CITIES AND TO	WNS										
Los Angeles	Total %	3,918,872	2,705,261 69.0	1,905,577 48.6	1,115,52 6 28.5	341,100 8.7	5,972 0.2	446,806 11.4	5,806 0.1	13,646 0.3	84,439 2.2
Vernon	Total %	101	82 81.2	45 44.6	6 5.9	22 21.8	0 0.0	15 14.9	0 0.0	0 0.0	13 12.9
Bell	Total %	35,927	34,259 95.4	33,266 92.6	1,621 4.5	511 1.4	23 0.1	362 1.0	97 0.3	0 0	47 0.1
Commerce	Total %	12,997	12,761 98.2	12,411 95.5	158 1.2	113 0.9	107 0.8	115 0.9	15 0.1	18 0.1	60 0.5
Montebello	Total %	63,416	57,461 90.6	48,291 76.1	5,389 8.5	762 1.2	289 0.5	8,080 12.7	39 0.1	40 0.1	526 0.8
Pico Rivera	Total %	63,724	60,026 94.2	57,673 90.5	3,480 5.5	453 0.7	250 0.4	1,636 2.6	14 0.0	22 0.0	196 0.3
Santa Fe Springs	Total %	17,436	15,665 89.8	13,771 79.0	1,500 8.6	595 3.4	73 0.4	1,221 7.0	5 0.0	198 1.1	73 0.4
Norwalk	Total %	106,360	93,069 87.5	74,182 69.7	12,070 11.3	4,191 3.9	412 0.4	13,947 13.1	337 0.3	305 0.3	916 0.9
La Mirada	Total %	49,130	30,874 62.8	20,118 40.9	16,818 34.2	956 1.9	55 0.1	9,679 19.7	66 0.1	80 0.2	1,358 2.8
Buena Park	Total %	82,771	59,839 72.3	33,002 39.9	21,271 25.7	2,464 3.0	236 0.3	23,596 28.5	541 0.7	62 0.1	1,599 1.9
Fullerton	Total %	139,491	87,981 63.1	49,743 35.7	47,255 33.9	3,359 2.4	180 0.1	34,281 24.6	418 0.3	131 0.1	4,124 3.0
Anaheim	Total %	346,776	250,020 72.1	185,945 53.6	90,059 26.0	7,346 2.1	491 0.1	54,762 15.8	1,476 0.4	447 0.1	6,250 1.8
Placentia	Total %	52,168	28,621 54.9	19,237 36.9	22,164 42.5	526 1.0	25 0.0	8,817 16.9	16 0.0	125 0.2	1,258 2.4
Yorba Linda	Total %	67,362	23,730 35.2	11,091 16.5	40,892 60.7	692 1.0	60 0.1	11,832 17.6	55 0.1	62 0.1	2,678 4.0
Chino Hills	Total %	77,266	50,087 64.8	21,332 27.6	24,699 32.0	3,076 4.0	139 0.2	25,502 33.0	38 0.0	286 0.4	2,194 2.8
Corona	Total %	161,614	96,460 59.7	69,843 43.2	60,741 37.6	7,396 4.6	244 0.2	18,274 11.3	703 0.4	384 0.2	4,029 2.5
Riverside	Total %	318,678	207,212 65.0	165,670 52.0	101,762 31.9	18,248 5.7	1,104 0.3	21,470 6.7	720 0.2	753 0.2	8,951 2.8
Colton	Total %	53,856	44,273 82.2	37,219 69.1	8,986 16.7	4,118 7.6	90 0.2	2,516 4.7	330 0.6	36 0.1	561 1.0
Grand Terrace	Total %	12,393	7,271 58.7	5,875 47.4	4,799 38.7	685 5.5	7 0.1	700 5.6	4 0.0	8 0.1	315 2.5
San Bernardino	Total %	214,581	175,498 81.8	135,870 63.3	33,769 15.7	28,726 13.4	555 0.3	9,810 4.6	537 0.3	455 0.2	4,859 2.3
Loma Linda	Total %	23,859	15,021 63.0	6,199 26.0	8,154 34.2	2,648 11.1	45 0.2	6,102 25.6	27 0.1	41 0.2	643 2.7
Redlands	Total %	70,442	31,156 44.2	21,405 30.4	36,939 52.4	3,817 5.4	299 0.4	5,281 7.5	354 0.5	280 0.4	2,067 2.9

Geography		Total Population	Total Minority	Hispanic or Latino (all Races)	White	Black or African American	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
Calimesa	Total %	8,379	2,392 28.5	2,167 25.9	5,850 69.8	93 1.1	37 0.4	95 1.1	0 0	0 0	137 1.6
Beaumont	Total %	42,191	23,591 55.9	17,892 42.4	17,447 41.4	2,158 5.1	78 0.2	3,383 8.0	80 0.2	64 0.2	1,089 2.6
Banning	Total %	30,643	17,918 58.5	13,315 43.5	12,170 39.7	2,442 8.0	739 2.4	1,406 4.6	16 0.1	113 0.4	442 1.4
Palm Springs	Total %	46,714	16,751 35.9	12,053 25.8	28,838 61.7	2,117 4.5	239 0.5	2,199 4.7	143 0.3	52 0.1	1,073 2.3
Cathedral City	Total %	53,268	35,830 67.3	32,213 60.5	16,654 31.3	1,264 2.4	95 0.2	2,225 4.2	33 0.1	108 0.2	676 1.3
Rancho Mirage	Total %	17,876	2,493 13.9	1,566 8.8	15,175 84.9	224 1.3	53 0.3	618 3.5	32 0.2	4 0.0	204 1.1
Palm Desert	Total %	51,045	16,569 32.5	13,438 26.3	33,269 65.2	819 1.6	46 0.1	2,237 4.4	29 0.1	83 0.2	1,124 2.2
Indio	Total %	85,401	62,609 73.3	58,020 67.9	21,921 25.7	2,336 2.7	211 0.2	1,995 2.3	47 0.1	27 0.0	844 1.0
Coachella	Total %	43,826	43,080 98.3	42,725 97.5	703 1.6	288 0.7	21 0.0	46 0.1	0 0.0	15 0.0	28 0.1

Source: California State Data Center 2016

		State	Counties									Cities	and Towns							
Househ Incom	old e	California	Los Angeles	Orange	San Bernardino	Riverside	Four- County Region	Los Angeles	Vernon	Bell	Commerce	Montebello	Pico Rivera	Santa Fe Springs	Norwalk	La Mirada	Buena Park	Fullerton	Anaheim	Placentia
Total Households		12,807,387	3,281,845	1,017,012	705,716	618,922	5,623,495	1,356,311	32	8,891	3,599	19,801	16,788	5,130	27,286	14,450	23,316	45,059	100,004	16,456
Less Than	Total	730,021	213,320	45,766	39,520	40,849	339,454	104,436	0	596	241	950	890	205	1,173	491	1,026	2,839	5,100	444
10,000	%	5.7	6.5	4.5	5.6	6.6	6.0	7.7	0	6.7	6.7	4.8	5.3	4	4.3	3.4	4.4	6.3	5.1	2.7
10,000-	Total	627,562	183,783	32,544	33,874	34,041	284,243	92,229	0	596	310	1,267	739	416	1,119	578	839	1,802	4,500	346
14,999	%	4.9	5.6	3.2	4.8	5.5	5.1	6.8	0	6.7	8.6	6.4	4.4	8.1	4.1	4	3.6	4	4.5	2.1
15,000-	Total	1,165,472	334,748	70,174	70,572	64,368	539,862	154,619	14	1,351	507	2,891	1,494	575	2,538	1,026	2,052	3,560	8,400	1,168
24,999	%	9.1	10.2	6.9	10	10.4	9.6	11.4	43.8	15.2	14.1	14.6	8.9	11.2	9.3	7.1	8.8	7.9	8.4	7.1
25,000-	Total	1,114,243	305,212	73,225	69,866	60,654	508,957	136,987	1	1,334	403	2,416	1,494	369	2,101	737	1,772	3,064	9,000	987
34,999	%	8.7	9.3	7.2	9.9	9.8	9.1	10.1	3.1	15.0	11.2	12.2	8.9	7.2	7.7	5.1	7.6	6.8	9	6
35,000-	Total	1,511,272	406,949	105,769	93,860	83,554	690,133	169,539	6	1,680	633	2,851	2,501	616	3,738	1,561	2,658	5,047	13,101	1,777
49,999	%	11.8	12.4	10.4	13.3	13.5	12.3	12.5	18.8	18.9	17.6	14.4	14.9	12	13.7	10.8	11.4	11.2	13.1	10.8
50,000-	Total	2,113,219	541,504	162,722	128,440	115,738	948,405	217,010	1	1,752	651	3,485	3,525	954	6,276	2,182	3,917	8,516	18,301	2,798
74,999	%	16.5	16.5	16	18.2	18.7	16.9	16	3.1	19.7	18.1	17.6	21	18.6	23	15.1	16.8	18.9	18.3	17
75,000-	Total	1,549,694	380,694	131,195	91,743	79,222	682,854	141,056	4	836	421	2,158	2,501	652	4,093	2,211	3,637	5,768	13,101	2,452
99,999	%	12.1	11.6	12.9	13	12.8	12.1	10.4	12.5	9.4	11.7	10.9	14.9	12.7	15	15.3	15.6	12.8	13.1	14.9
100,000-	Total	1,946,723	459,458	180,011	103,035	84,792	827,296	164,114	5	551	317	2,396	2,602	939	4,529	3,222	4,360	7,029	15,801	2,896
149,000	%	15.2	14	17.7	14.6	13.7	14.7	12.1	15.6	6.2	8.8	12.1	15.5	18.3	16.6	22.3	18.7	15.6	15.8	17.6
150,000-	Total	934,939	206,756	95,599	42,343	32,803	377,501	73,241	0	133	101	871	705	277	1,255	1,416	1,609	3,289	6,800	2,057
199,999	%	7.3	6.3	9.4	6	5.3	6.7	5.4	0	1.5	2.8	4.4	4.2	5.4	4.6	9.8	6.9	7.3	6.8	12.5
200,000 or	Total	1,114,243	249,420	120,007	32,463	22,281	424,172	101,723	1	53	14	515	353	133	518	1,040	1,469	4,145	5,900	1,497
more	%	8.7	7.6	11.8	4.6	3.6	7.5	7.5	3.1	0.6	0.4	2.6	2.1	2.6	1.9	7.2	6.3	9.2	5.9	9.1
Median Household Income		\$63,783	\$57,952	\$78,145	\$54,469	\$57,972	NA	\$51,538	\$38,333	\$38,823	\$42,235	\$47,518	\$57,203	\$58,147	\$61,050	\$81,956	\$70,341	\$67,101	\$61,826	\$80,668

Household	hold									Cities and Towns									
Income (\$)		Yorba Linda	Chino Hills	Corona	Riverside	Colton	Grand Terrace	San Bernardino	Loma Linda	Redlands	Calimesa	Beaumont	Banning	Palm Springs	Cathedral City	Rancho Mirage	Palm Desert	Indio	Coachella
Total Households		21,829	24,034	49,350	91,940	15,982	4,383	57,323	8,719	24,046	3,323	12,752	10,955	23,556	17,680	9,510	23,729	27,290	11,379
Less Than	Total	458	889	2,221	5,516	1,039	153	5,675	898	1,371	196	701	800	1,696	1,344	561	1,590	2,047	808
10,000	%	2.1	3.7	4.5	6	6.5	3.5	9.9	10.3	5.7	5.9	5.5	7.3	7.2	7.6	5.9%	6.7%	7.5	7.1
10,000-	Total	196	457	1,777	4,689	831	70	5,675	488	962	206	459	767	1,720	1,255	352	1,258	1,337	762
14,999	%	0.9	1.9	3.6	5.1	5.2	1.6	9.9	5.6	4	6.2	3.6	7	7.3	7.1	3.7%	5.3%	4.9	6.7
15,000-	Total	917	961	3,751	9,010	1,998	241	8,426	732	1,876	236	842	1,632	3,439	2,493	1,056	2,420	3,138	1,912
24,999	%	4.2	4	7.6	9.8	12.5	5.5	14.7	8.4	7.8	7.1	6.6	14.9	14.6	14.1	11.1%	10.2%	11.5	16.8
25,000-	Total	917	1,178	4,195	8,367	2,493	482	6,707	924	2,140	601	765	1,304	2,662	2,334	780	2,302	2,893	2,025
34,999	%	4.2	4.9	8.5	9.1	15.6	11	11.7	10.6	8.9	18.1	6	11.9	11.3	13.2	8.2%	9.7%	10.6	17.8
35,000-	Total	1,572	1,851	5,182	11,952	2,413	741	9,057	1,195	2,525	555	1,734	2,092	3,039	2,935	980	3,275	4,339	1,764
49,999	%	7.2	7.7	10.5	13	15.1	16.9	15.8	13.7	10.5	16.7	13.6	19.1	12.9	16.6	10.3%	13.8%	15.9	15.5
50,000-	Total	2,314	3,749	8,340	17,193	3,420	991	9,286	1,412	4,473	502	2,461	2,136	3,910	2,935	1,398	4,770	5,185	2,310
74,999	%	10.6	15.6	16.9	18.7	21.4	22.6	16.2	16.2	18.6	15.1	19.3	19.5	16.6	16.6	14.7%	20.1%	19	20.3
75,000-	Total	2,750	3,317	7,106	12,872	1,646	574	5,732	1,151	2,958	356	1,798	1,074	2,214	1,591	913	2,444	3,084	1,035
99,999	%	12.6	13.8	14.4	14	10.3	13.1	10	13.2	12.3	10.7	14.1	9.8	9.4	9	9.6%	10.3%	11.3	9.1
100,000-	Total	4,562	5,912	9,870	12,964	1,582	693	4,758	854	3,992	445	2,601	822	2,450	1,839	1,512	2,705	3,248	558
149,000	%	20.9	24.6	20	14.1	9.9	15.8	8.3	9.8	16.6	13.4	20.4	7.5	10.4	10.4	1539%	11.4%	11.9	4.9
150,000-	Total	3,231	2,860	3,849	5,424	432	333	1,376	410	1,948	126	714	197	1,084	548	533	1,376	1,283	148
199,999	%	14.8	11.9	7.8	5.9	2.7	7.6	2.4	4.7	8.1	3.8	5.6	1.8	4.6	3.1	5.6%	5.8%	4.7	1.3
200,000 or	Total	4,890	2,836	3,109	3,953	112	105	631	645	1,827	96	689	121	1,319	407	1,436	1,590	737	57
more	%	22.4	11.8	6.3	4.3	0.7	2.4	1.1	7.4	7.6	2.9	5.4	1.1	5.6	2.3	15.1%	6.7%	2.7	0.5
Median Household Income		\$119,697	\$97,222	\$72,309	\$58,979	\$43,966	\$64,188	\$38,456	\$51,390	\$66,514	\$46,070	\$68,369	\$40,627	\$46,059	\$41,696	\$66,083	\$53,701	\$49,551	\$36,124

Source: ACS 2012-2016, 5-year estimates

Table A-6. Family Income below Poverty

Geography	Percent of Families Below Poverty
STATE	
California	11.8
COUNTIES	
Los Angeles	13.9
Orange	8.7
Riverside	12.8
San Bernardino	15.4
CITIES	
Los Angeles	17.2
Vernon	46.7
Bell	21.6
Commerce	13.6
Montebello	10.9
Pico Rivera	9.7
Santa Fe Springs	9.3
Norwalk	11.0
La Mirada	4.6
Buena Park	10.1
Fullerton	9.5
Anaheim	13.2
Placentia	6.3
Yorba Linda	2.8
Chino Hills	5.6
Corona	9.1

Geography	Percent of Families Below Poverty
Riverside	12.8
Colton	17.5
Grand Terrace	5.2
San Bernardino	28.1
Loma Linda	14.8
Redlands	9.0
Calimesa	10.0
Beaumont	8.6
Banning	17.5
Palm Springs	13.9
Cathedral City	17.6
Rancho Mirage	6.3
Palm Desert	9.2
Indio	14.0
Coachella	26.6

Source: California State Data Center 2016a

Table	Δ-7	l imited	Fnalish	Proficiency
10010			Light	

Geography	Population 5 Years and Over	Percent of Population 5 years and Older That Speaks English "Less Than Very Well"				
STATE						
California	36,154,645	18.6				
COUNTIES						
Los Angeles	9,421,033	24.9				
Orange	2,942,677	20.2				
Riverside	2,166,330	15.0				
San Bernardino	1,952,366	15.7				
CITIES AND TOWNS						
Los Angeles	3,672,082	27.0				
Vernon	95	7.4				
Bell	32,928	41.0				
Commerce	12,054	31.5				
Montebello	59,241	29.9				
Pico Rivera	59,367	27.4				
Santa Fe Springs	16,334	19.3				
Norwalk	99,396	29.2				
La Mirada	46,538	15.2				
Buena Park	76,940	32.7				
Fullerton	131,260	21.7				
Anaheim	321,795	26.9				
Placentia	48,918	16.0				
Yorba Linda	63,970	8.2				
Chino Hills	73,036	12.8				
Corona	150,932	13.5				

Geography	Population 5 Years and Over	Percent of Population 5 years and Older That Speaks English "Less Than Very Well"
Riverside	297,502	15.0
Colton	48,889	18.6
Grand Terrace	11,943	8.2
San Bernardino	196,168	21.6
Loma Linda	22,091	17.0
Redlands	65,543	6.5
Calimesa	8,170	5.7
Beaumont	38,776	9.5
Banning	28,756	11.8
Palm Springs	45,072	10.0
Cathedral City	49,717	21.9
Rancho Mirage	17,666	3.8
Palm Desert	49,014	8.3
Indio	79,317	24.0
Coachella	39,970	47.1

Source: California State Data Center 2016b

Appendix B. Socioeconomics Conditions Maps

Socioeconomics Technical Memorandum

This page is intentionally blank.

Figure B-1: Community Facilities, Sheet 1



Figure B-1: Community Facilities, Sheet 2



Figure B-1: Community Facilities, Sheet 3



Figure B-1: Community Facilities, Sheet 4


Figure B-1: Community Facilities, Sheet 5



Figure B-1: Community Facilities, Sheet 6



Figure B-1: Community Facilities, Sheet 7



Figure B-2: Race and Ethnicity, Sheet 1



_ . _ .

_--

.









Figure B-2: Race and Ethnicity, Sheet 4



Figure B-3: Minority Population



Figure B-4: Median Household Income



Figure B-5: Households below Poverty



-

Figure B-6: Limited English Proficiency



This page is intentionally blank.