

---

---

## 3.15 Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice, and Protection of Children



### **3.15 SOCIOECONOMICS, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, AND PROTECTION OF CHILDREN**

#### **3.15.1 Affected Environment**

##### **3.15.1.1 Introduction**

This section evaluates effects related to socioeconomics, environmental justice (as required under Executive Order (EO) 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations), and protection of children (as required under EO 13045, Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks).

##### **3.15.1.2 Definition**

Socioeconomics includes an evaluation of the basic attributes and resources associated with the human environment, particularly population, and economic activity. Economic activity encompasses employment, personal income, and industrial growth. Impacts on these fundamental socioeconomic components influence other issues such as housing availability and provision of public services.

##### **3.15.1.3 Federal Requirements**

EO 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Population*, provides that “each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.” The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Guidance on Environmental Justice of 10 December 1997 provides direction on type of information generally used, provide a finding on whether the proposed action has adverse human health effects on the minority populations, low-income populations, or Indian tribes, and provide a second finding on whether the proposed action has other adverse environmental effects on impact the minority populations, low-income populations, and Indian tribes.<sup>1</sup>

Section 1-101 of Executive Order 12898 provides specific guidance to federal agencies for determining whether or not disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects are caused by programs, policies, and activities. The guidance includes:

“When determining whether human health effects are disproportionately high and adverse, agencies are to consider the following three factors to the extent practicable:

- (a) Whether the health effects, which may be measured in risks and rates, are significant (as employed by NEPA), or above generally accepted norms. Adverse health effects may include bodily impairment, infirmity, illness, or death; and
- (b) Whether the risk or rate of hazard exposure by a minority population, low-income population, or Indian tribe to an environmental hazard is significant (as employed by NEPA) and appreciably exceeds or is likely to appreciably exceed the risk or rate to the general population or other appropriate comparison group; and
- (c) Whether health effects occur in a minority population, low-income population, or Indian tribe affected by cumulative or multiple adverse exposures from environmental hazards.”

---

<sup>1</sup> The definitions for “low-income population,” “minority,” and “minority population” are found in Section 1-101 of Executive Order 12898.

Further guidance is provided for determining disproportionate environmental effects:

“When determining whether environmental effects are disproportionately high and adverse, agencies are to consider the following three factors to the extent practicable:

(a) Whether there is or will be an impact on the natural or physical environment that significantly (as employed by NEPA) and adversely affects a minority population, low-income population, or Indian tribe. Such effects may include ecological, cultural, human health, economic, or social impacts on minority communities, low-income communities, or Indian tribes when those impacts are interrelated to impacts on the natural or physical environment; and

(b) Whether environmental effects are significant (as employed by NEPA) and are or may be having an adverse impact on minority populations, low-income populations, or Indian tribes that appreciably exceeds or is likely to appreciably exceed those on the general population or other appropriate comparison group; and

(c) Whether the environmental effects occur or would occur in a minority population, low-income population, or Indian tribe affected by cumulative or multiple adverse exposures from environmental hazards.”

For this Proposed Action, analysis for EO 12898 requires assessment of readily available demographic data on the local, regional, and national populations, including race and ethnicity, age, income, and poverty metrics. Information to support this analysis is derived from US Census Bureau and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) readily accessible documents and internet sites. The US Decennial Census forms the basis of the data for 2000, which is completed every 10 years, with the next scheduled census occurring in 2010. The US Census Bureau also conducts ongoing surveys to supplement the decennial survey, and the most recent US Census American Community Survey (ACS) for 2007 data is used to document the most recent conditions. The SANDAG publication “2030 Regional Growth Forecast Update” is referenced for economic and population trends in the San Diego County area through 2030. Cumulative impacts are addressed in Section 4.

EO 13045 *Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*, focuses on environmental health risks and safety risks that may affect children. This EO was prompted by the recognition that children are more sensitive than adults to adverse environmental health and safety risks because they are still undergoing physiological growth and development. For this Proposed Action, analysis for EO 13045 requires assessment of readily available information regarding demographic data on the local, regional, and national populations, and, in particular, children less than 18 years old to evaluate the number and distribution of children in the region and whether these children are exposed to environmental health and safety risks from the Proposed Action. Information to support this analysis is derived from the US Census Bureau (2000 census and 2007 ACS) and identified locations with potentially high concentrations of children, such as schools, recreational areas for children, and residential areas.

### **3.15.1.3.1 Regional Setting**

The Silver Strand Training Complex (SSTC) is located in a populated urban area and is accessible from the greater San Diego metropolitan area via the Coronado Bay Bridge and State Route 75 through Imperial Beach. As presented in Section 3.1, Land Use, the land use in the surrounding areas consists of mixed residential and commercial, hotel/motel, commercial recreation, civic use, open space, and military land uses.

### 3.15.1.3.2 Region of Influence

The region of influence (ROI) is the area of southwestern San Diego County, surrounding SSTC. This area includes the cities of Coronado and Imperial Beach, and also includes Navy housing communities. The summary of socioeconomic activity in the ROI is compiled from regional and federal government sources. For environmental justice and protection of children, the air quality, water resources, acoustic, and public health and safety concerns with the ROI are evaluated in regard to effects to low-income, minority, and children populations.

### 3.15.1.4 Regional Employment

The economy of the San Diego region is diversified; the leading employment sectors are business and professional services, retail trade, government, and hospitality. As of December 2008, the county average unemployment rate was 6.9 percent, which is below the state rate of 5.6 percent but above the federal rate of 4.5 percent (San Diego Workforce Partnership 2008). The estimated total employment for San Diego County, the City of Imperial Beach, and the City of Coronado is shown in Table 3.15-1. The estimated total employment for San Diego County is expected to increase 36 percent from 2000 to 2030. The City of Imperial Beach has a smaller anticipated increase of 18 percent (SANDAG 2008). This is due to the full use of properties within the city for residential and commercial structures—the built-out character of the City of Imperial Beach. The City of Coronado is projected to have an increase of 12 percent due to the similar built-out character of the city.

**Table 3.15-1: Estimated Total Employment**

	2000 <sup>1</sup>	2004 <sup>2</sup>	2010 <sup>3</sup>	2020 <sup>3</sup>	2030 <sup>3</sup>	Percent Change from 2000 to 2030
San Diego County	1,384,673	1,449,349	1,573,742	1,741,033	1,913,682	36%
City of Imperial Beach <sup>4</sup>	3,931	4,189	4,189	4,539	4,792	18%
City of Coronado <sup>4</sup>	29,913	33,708	33,935	34,041	34,043	12%

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Census 2000, <sup>2</sup> SANDAG 2008, <sup>3</sup> US Census 2007, <sup>4</sup> Includes military and civilian employment

The Naval Base Coronado (NBC) employs over 36,000 military and civilian personnel and is considered the largest workforce in San Diego County (Department of the Navy 2008). Many of the NBC military and civilian workforce support training activities at SSTC.

### 3.15.1.5 Regional Housing

According to the 2000 census, housing stock in San Diego County was 1,040,149 units. As summarized in Table 3.15-2, the number of housing units for San Diego County is expected to increase 25 percent from the year 2000 to 2030 (SANDAG 2008). The City of Imperial Beach projects a smaller increase of 19 percent over the same 30-year time frame. The City of Coronado has a projected housing increase of only 2 percent. The relatively small increases for Imperial Beach and Coronado are because of the built-out character of these cities.

**Table 3.15-2: Estimated Total Housing Units**

	2000 <sup>1</sup>	2007 <sup>2</sup>	2010 <sup>3</sup>	2020 <sup>3</sup>	2030 <sup>3</sup>	Percent Change From 2000 To 2030
San Diego County	1,040,149	1,131,749	1,174,180	1,309,340	1,383,803	25%
City of Imperial Beach	9,739	9,881	9,830	11,349	12,063	19%
City of Coronado	9,494	9,436	9,405	9,690	9,796	2%

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Census 2000, <sup>2</sup> US Census 2007 American Community Survey, <sup>3</sup> SANDAG 2008

Naval Amphibious Base (NAB) Coronado includes military housing for both unaccompanied personnel and families. Unaccompanied personnel housing for officers is located on the southwest bayside section of NAB; unaccompanied enlisted housing is located on both the oceanside and bayside portions of NAB. Officer family housing is located in the southern bayside section of NAB; this housing area consists of single-family and duplex housing units, some of which front San Diego Bay.

Naval Special Warfare student housing is located on the oceanside portion of NAB. Permanent personnel and transient students are billeted in housing on the bayside portion of NAB. An enlisted family housing area is located immediately south of the Fiddler's Cove Marina; the housing area consists of duplex and townhome units and the Silver Strand Elementary School, which is operated by the Coronado Unified School District for students living on Silver Strand in Navy housing and Coronado residential areas.

### 3.15.1.6 Population Demographics

SSTC and neighboring communities are located in the southwestern portion of San Diego County, California. Table 3.15-3 presents population characteristics, including the population in 2000, estimated 2007 population, and projected population for 2010, 2020, and 2030. The projected percent change from 2000 to 2030 for San Diego County population is expected to increase 29 percent, while population growth for the cities of Imperial Beach and Coronado are expected to increase at lower rates of 17 and 19 percent, respectively, primarily due to the built-out character of these two communities.

**Table 3.15-3: Estimated Population Growth for San Diego County, SSTC, and Surrounding Area**

	2000 <sup>1</sup>	2007 <sup>2</sup>	2010 <sup>3</sup>	2020 <sup>3</sup>	2030 <sup>3</sup>	Percent Change from 2000 to 2030
San Diego County	2,813,833	2,954,960	3,245,279	3,635,855	3,984,753	29%
City of Imperial Beach	26,992	25,023	27,799	28,331	32,590	17%
City of Coronado	24,100	22,022	26,591	27,512	29,738	19%

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Census 2000, <sup>2</sup> US Census 2007 American Community Survey, <sup>3</sup> SANDAG 2008

#### 3.15.1.6.1 Minority Populations

Table 3.15-4 provides the racial and ethnic composition for the cities, county, state, and nation, using the 2000 census and 2007 ACS data. In general, the City of Imperial Beach has a racial and ethnic composition similar to the County of San Diego and California while the City of Coronado has fewer minorities than the county, state, or national populations. The City of Imperial Beach has a higher percentage of Hispanic than county, state or national populations.

**Table 3.15-4: Population, Race, and Ethnicity for the SSTC ROI**

Race / Ethnicity	City of Imperial Beach		City of Coronado		San Diego County		California		USA	
	2000 <sup>1</sup>	2007 <sup>2</sup>	2000	2007	2000	2007	2000	2007	2000	2007
<b>Population</b>	<b>26,992</b>	<b>25,023</b>	<b>24,100</b>	<b>22,202</b>	<b>2,813,833</b>	<b>2,954,960</b>	<b>33,871,648</b>	<b>36,264,467</b>	<b>281,421,906</b>	<b>298,757,310</b>
White persons (%)	62.3	71.8	84.4	89.2	66.5	69.5	59.5	60.4	75.1	74.1
Black or African American persons (%)	5.3	5.1	5.1	4.9	5.7	5.2	6.7	6.3	12.3	12.4
American Indian and Alaskan Native persons (%)	1.1	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.9	0.7	1.0	0.7	0.9	0.8
Asian persons (%)	6.5	5.4	3.7	1.9	8.9	10.2	10.9	12.2	3.6	4.3
Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander (%)	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.1
Other race (%)	17.8	11.4	3.1	0.8	12.8	10.3	16.8	16.8	5.5	6.2
Two or more races (%)	6.5	5.0	2.6	2.4	4.7	3.6	4.7	3.3	2.4	2.1
Hispanic <sup>3</sup>	40.1	43.9	9.8	13.1	26.7	29.9	32.4	35.7	12.5	14.7

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Census 2000, <sup>2</sup> From the US Census 2007 American Community Survey, <sup>3</sup> The Hispanic category is an ethnic, rather than a racial distinction. These tables therefore include only non-Hispanic individuals in the black, white, and other categories to avoid over counting.

### 3.15.1.6.2 Low-Income Populations

Table 3.15-5 depicts median household income and poverty levels for the cities, county, state, and nation, using the 2000 census and 2007 ACS data. In general, the City of Imperial Beach has a median household income below Coronado, San Diego County, California, and the USA. The City of Imperial Beach also has a greater percentage of persons below the poverty level than Coronado, San Diego County, California, and the USA.

**Table 3.15-5: Low-Income Populations for the SSTC ROI**

Metrics	City of Imperial Beach		City of Coronado		San Diego County		California		USA	
	2000 <sup>1</sup>	2007 <sup>2</sup>	2000	2007	2000	2007	2000	2007	2000	2007
Population	26,992	25,023	24,100	22,202	2,813,833	2,954,960	33,871,648	36,264,467	281,421,906	298,757,310
Median household income	\$35,882	\$46,214	\$66,544	\$80,132	\$47,067	\$71,139	\$47,493	\$58,361	\$41,994	\$50,007
% Persons below poverty	18.8	16.8	5.0	7.6	12.4	11.3	14.2	13.0	12.4	13.3

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Census 2000, <sup>2</sup> US Census 2007 American Community Survey

### 3.15.1.7 Children in the Communities

EO 13035 requires assessment of readily available information regarding demographic data on the local, regional, and national populations for children. Children are defined as individuals less than 18 years of age for the purposes of this assessment. Information to support this analysis is derived from the US Census Bureau (2000 census and 2007 ACS) and identified locations with potentially high concentrations of children, such as schools, recreational areas for children, and residential areas in areas potentially exposed to project impacts.

#### 3.15.1.7.1 Population of Children

Table 3.15-6 depicts percentage of population less than 18 years of age and average family size for the cities, county, state, and nation, using the 2000 census and 2007 ACS data. The City of Imperial Beach's population of children is similar to San Diego and California, while the City of Coronado has fewer children than the City of Imperial Beach, county, state, or national populations. City of Coronado population includes children located in NAB family housing as well. Areas within the cities of Coronado and Imperial Beach with higher concentrations of children are addressed in the following subsection.

**Table 3.15-6: Population of Children in the SSTC ROI**

Metrics	City of Imperial Beach		City of Coronado		San Diego County		California		USA	
	2000 <sup>1</sup>	2007 <sup>2</sup>	2000	2007	2000	2007	2000	2007	2000	2007
Population	26,992	25,023	24,100	22,202	2,813,833	2,954,960	33,871,648	36,264,467	281,421,906	298,757,310
Population less than 18 years of age (%)	29.4%	26.8%	16.0%	17.2%	25.7%	25.1%	27.3%	25.9%	25.7%	24.7%
Average family size	3.30	3.17	2.84	2.88	3.29	3.34	3.43	3.52	3.14	3.19

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Census 2000, <sup>2</sup> US Census 2007 American Community Survey

#### 3.15.1.7.2 Schools

According to the California Department of Education, Coronado Unified School District, South Bay Union School District, and Sweetwater Union High School District, approximately 12,000 students are enrolled in elementary, middle and high schools in the cities of Imperial Beach and Coronado, including the NAB family housing area. Schools located within the region of influence (as defined by the maximum extent of acoustic impacts, see Section 3.6) include the following public elementary, middle and high schools: Bayside Elementary School, Central Elementary School, Harbor View Elementary School, Imperial Beach Elementary School, Mar Vista High School, Mar Vista Middle School, Oneonta School Elementary School, Silver Strand Elementary School, and West View Elementary School (Figure 3.1-3).

Of these schools, three elementary schools are near SSTC. Bayside Elementary School is located on the north side of Imperial Beach, adjacent to the salt works in south San Diego Bay. West View Elementary School is located on the southern boundary of SSTC-South (SSTC-S). The Silver Strand Elementary School is located in on the bayside portion of SSTC-North (SSTC-N), approximately 1,000 feet from the ocean beach and 500 feet from bayside beaches.



### 3.15.1.7.3 Recreational Areas

Recreational areas in the ROI include nature preserves, parks, parkways, beaches, playgrounds, and community gardens. Outdoor recreation entails programs, activities, or opportunities dependent upon the natural environment. Examples include fishing, picnicking, surfing, bird-watching, hiking and interpretive trails, and camping areas. Many outdoor recreational opportunities are available in the SSTC ROI (see Table 3.1-1).

One of the main recreational opportunities for children in the ROI is the YMCA Camp Surf, located in the southwest corner of SSTC-S. The YMCA operates approximately twelve, one-week camp sessions annually, for children between the ages of seven and sixteen, on 80 acres of land under lease from the US Navy. This camp, located on ocean frontage, consists of housing units, mobile homes, and recreational vehicles associated with the camp. According to the YMCA, approximately 10,000 children use Camp Surf each year. While some of the children are day campers, the majority are onsite 24 hours per day.

### 3.15.1.8 Current Mitigation Measures

There are no current mitigation measures related to socioeconomics, environmental justice, and protection of children. However, mitigation measures in place for other resources (e.g., Section 3.3 Air Quality, Section 3.5 Water Resources, Section 3.6 Acoustic Environment, and Section 3.16 Public Health and Safety) also ensure that non-participants, including children, are not affected by Navy actions:

- Air Quality (Section 3.3) – Air emissions do occur at SSTC but do not pose human health or environmental risks as emissions are *de minimis*.
- Water Resources (Section 3.5) – Water discharges do occur at SSTC but do not pose health or environmental risks as water quality standards are not exceeded by discharges.
- Acoustic Environment (Section 3.6) – Major sources of sound at SSTC include helicopters used for insertion and extraction of exercise participants, amphibious vessels involved in landing exercises, pile-drivers involved in ELCAS training, and munitions used in a variety of exercises. Based on the distribution and magnitude of noise sources, surrounding communities, including Coronado, Imperial Beach, and NAB housing areas, are affected by training noise.
- Public Health and Safety (Section 3.16) – The Navy has specific and documented procedures in place to ensure that non-participants, including children, are not endangered by Navy actions, including fencing, guards, and signage.

### 3.15.2 Environmental Consequences

This section focuses on potential impacts and overall changes, as they relate to employment, housing, low income and minority populations, and protection of children, associated with implementation of all current and proposed training activities at SSTC. Assessments of environmental justice and protection of children are intertwined with other environmental topics. In particular, air emissions, water discharges, and noise emissions from the Proposed Action may affect the quality of air, water resources, and public health and safety in communities surrounding SSTC. Air emissions and pollutants are addressed in Section 3.3, Air Quality, in accordance with the Clean Air Act. Effects to water quality of the ocean are addressed in Section 3.5, Water Resources. The effect of noise from training is addressed in Section 3.6, Acoustic Environment and health and safety issues are addressed in Section 3.16, Public Health and Safety.

#### 3.15.2.1 Approach to Analysis

The socioeconomic analysis addresses the potential for Navy training activities to affect, either positively or negatively, the basic attributes and resources associated with the human environment, particularly,

population and economic activity. Economic activity encompasses employment, personal income, and industrial growth.

In compliance with EO 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations*, this analysis addresses, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of the Proposed Action on minority and low-income populations. Minority and low-income populations are identified using readily available demographic data on the local, regional, and national populations, including race and ethnicity, age, income, and poverty metrics.<sup>2</sup> The Navy's training activities that result in air emissions, water discharges, and noise emissions from the Proposed Action are considered to have significant environmental justice impacts if training activities generate disproportionately high environmental effects on low income or minority populations within the ROI.

In compliance with EO 13045, *Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*, this analysis examines demographic data on the local, regional, and national populations; and, in particular on children, to evaluate the number and distribution of children in the region and whether these children are exposed to environmental health and safety risks from the Proposed Action. The Navy's training activities that result in air emissions, water discharges, and noise emissions are considered to have a significant environmental health and safety risks if SSTC activities generate disproportionately high environmental effects on populations of children within the ROI. Potential effects include health and safety concerns such as hearing loss, non-auditory health effects, and interruption of communication or attention in nearby residences and schools with children present (see Section 3.6, Acoustic Environment)

### **3.15.2.2 No Action Alternative**

Under the No Action Alternative, the number of personnel stationed at SSTC and tempo of training would remain the same as the baseline conditions.

#### **3.15.2.2.1 Socioeconomics**

No changes to the current socioeconomic conditions (employment, housing, and population growth) of southwestern San Diego County are expected under the No Action Alternative as the Navy will maintain baseline levels of personnel and staffing already employed in the region. In addition, increases in training activities associated with the Proposed Action and alternatives are not expected to disrupt normal business operations including hotel, tourism, and restaurant commerce in the ROI. Therefore, regional and community economic, employment, housing, and population growth are not affected by the No Action Alternative.

#### **3.15.2.2.2 Environmental Justice**

Based on the analysis presented herein on air quality, water resources, acoustics, and public health and safety associated with the No Action Alternative, the following conclusions are presented in regard to human health and environmental effects to low-income communities and minority populations:

---

<sup>2</sup> Demographic information to support analyses related to Environmental Justice and Protection of Children is derived from US Census Bureau and SANDAG readily accessible documents and internet sites. The US Decennial Census forms the basis of the data for 2000, which is completed every 10 years, with the next scheduled census occurring in 2010. The US Census Bureau also conducts ongoing surveys to supplement the decennial survey, and the most recent US Census ACS for 2007 data is used to document the most recent conditions. The SANDAG publication "2030 Regional Growth Forecast Update" is referenced for economic and population trends in the San Diego County area through 2030.

- Air Quality (Section 3.3) – Air emissions do occur from the No Action Alternative but do not pose human health or environmental risks as emissions are *de minimis*, and, do not pose health or environmental risks disproportionately on low-income communities and minority populations and Indian tribes, as all surrounding communities are affected by air emissions from this action.
- Water Resources (Section 3.5) – Water discharges do occur from the No Action alternative but do not pose health or environmental risks as water quality standards are not exceeded by discharges, and, do not pose health or environmental risks disproportionately on low-income communities and minority populations and Indian tribes as all surrounding communities are affected by water discharges from this action.
- Acoustic Environment (Section 3.6) – Major sources of sound at SSTC include helicopters used for insertion and extraction of exercise participants, amphibious vessels involved in landing exercises, pile-drivers involved in ELCAS training, and munitions used in a variety of exercises. Concerns related to noise from the No Action Alternative on the surrounding communities include hearing loss, non-auditory health effects, and speech interference/temporary attention. Based on the distribution and magnitude of noise impacts under the No Action Alternative, surrounding communities, including Coronado, Imperial Beach, and NAB housing areas, are affected by training noise; however, no disproportionate effect on low income or minority populations or Indian tribes occur.
- Public Health and Safety (Section 3.16) – The Navy has specific and documented procedures in place to ensure that non-participants, including children, are not endangered by Navy actions, including fencing, guards, and signage.

Therefore, no disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of the No Action are anticipated on minority populations and low-income populations.

### **3.15.2.2.3 Protection of Children**

Based on the analysis presented in Section 3.3 Air Quality, 3.5 Water Resources, and 3.6 Acoustic Environment associated with the No Action Alternative, no disproportionate environmental health and safety risks specific to children are expected.

### **3.15.2.3 Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)**

Implementation of Alternative 1 would increase the training tempo and would include the introduction of new types of training, conducting existing routine training at additional locations within SSTC established training areas, and increasing training access to, and availability of, existing beach and inland training areas.

#### **3.15.2.3.1 Socioeconomics**

Implementation of Alternative 1 would not result in an increase in permanently stationed personnel or employees at SSTC. Training activities and tempo under Alternative 1 would be implemented by Navy personnel and staffing already employed in the region. In addition, increases in training activities associated with the Proposed Action and alternatives are not expected to disrupt normal business operations including hotel, tourism, and restaurant commerce in the ROI. Therefore, regional and community economic, employment, housing, and population growth are not expected to be affected by Alternative 1.

#### **3.15.2.3.2 Environmental Justice**

Based on the analysis presented herein on air quality, water resources, acoustics, and public health and safety associated with the No Action Alternative, the following conclusions are presented in regard to human health and environmental effects to low-income communities and minority populations:

- Air Quality (Section 3.3) – Air emissions do occur from Alternative 1 but do not pose human health or environmental risks as emissions are *de minimis*. Additionally, they do not pose health or environmental risks disproportionately on low-income communities and minority populations and Indian tribes as all surrounding communities are affected by air emissions from this action.
- Water Resources (Section 3.5) – Water discharges do occur from the Alternative 1 but do not pose health or environmental risks as water quality standards are not exceeded by discharges. Additionally, they do not pose health or environmental risks disproportionately on low-income communities and minority populations and Indian tribes as all surrounding communities are affected by water discharges from this action.
- Acoustic Environment (Section 3.6) – Major sources of sound at SSTC include helicopters used for insertion and extraction of exercise participants, amphibious vessels involved in landing exercises, pile-drivers involved in ELCAS training, and munitions used in a variety of exercises. Concerns related to noise from Alternative 1 on the surrounding communities include hearing loss, non-auditory health effects, and speech interference/temporary attention. Based on the distribution and magnitude of noise impacts under Alternative 1, surrounding communities, including Coronado, Imperial Beach, and NAB housing areas, are affected by training noise; however, no disproportionate effect on low income or minority populations or Indian tribes occur.
- Public Health and Safety (Section 3.16) – The Navy has specific and documented procedures in place to ensure that non-participants, including children, are not endangered by Navy actions, including fencing, guards, and signage.

Therefore, no disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of Alternative 1 are anticipated on minority populations and low-income populations.

#### **3.15.2.3.3 Protection of Children**

Based on the analysis presented in Section 3.3 Air Quality, 3.5 Water Resources, and 3.6 Acoustic Environment under Alternative 1, no disproportionate environmental health and safety risks specific to children are expected.

#### **3.15.2.4 Alternative 2**

The only difference between Alternative 1 and 2 is that, under Alternative 2, all SSTC-N oceanside beach training areas would be available for Navy training, regardless of time of year. Water quality, air quality, and acoustical noise effects are the same as Alternative 1. Thus, implementation of Alternative 2 would have similar socioeconomic, environmental justice, and protection of children effects as Alternative 1.

#### **3.15.3 Proposed Mitigation Measures**

No adverse socioeconomic effects were identified; therefore, no proposed mitigation measures are warranted. However, mitigation measures proposed for other resources (e.g., Water Resources [Section 3.5], Acoustic Environment [Section 3.6], and Public Health and Safety [Section 3.16]) would serve to further minimize effects related to environmental justice and protection of children.

#### **3.15.4 Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Effects**

There are no unavoidable adverse socioeconomic effects identified.

#### **3.15.5 Summary of Effects**

Table 3.15-7 summarizes effects and mitigation measures for the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2.

**Table 3.15-7: Summary of Effects**

<b>Alternative</b>	<b>Summary of Effects</b>
<b>No Action Alternative</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Navy presence currently has a beneficial socioeconomic impact on the region.</li> <li>• EO 12898 – There are no disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of the No Action Alternative on minority populations and low-income population or Indian tribes.</li> <li>• EO 13045 – Under the No Action Alternative no disproportionate environmental health and safety risks specific to children are expected.</li> </ul>
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Socioeconomics - Existing regional population and associated housing impacts, employment rates, and regional economy would remain unchanged.</li> <li>• EO 12898 – There would be no disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of Alternative 1 on minority populations and low-income populations or Indian tribes.</li> <li>• EO 13045 – Under Alternative 1 no disproportionate environmental health and safety risks specific to children are expected.</li> </ul>
<b>Alternative 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts are expected to be the same as Alternative 1.</li> </ul>
<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mitigation measures proposed for other resources (e.g., Water Resources [Section 3.5], Acoustic Environment [Section 3.6], and Public Health and Safety [Section 3.16]) would serve to further minimize effects related to environmental justice and protection of children.</li> </ul>

This page intentionally left blank