

US 64 - NC 49 Corridor Study

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Prepared by



Prepared for



North Carolina Department of Transportation
Transportation Planning Branch

April 2005

US 64 - NC 49 Strategic Highway Corridor Study Environmental Justice Technical Memorandum

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE POPULATIONS DEFINED	1
1.2	PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION OF REPORT	1
2	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE POPULATIONS	2
2.1	DATA SOURCES.....	2
2.2	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE STUDY AREA DESCRIPTION	2
2.3	2000 US CENSUS DATA.....	5
2.3.1	Racial Minority Concentrations.....	5
2.3.1.1	Blacks.....	5
2.3.1.2	Asians.....	5
2.3.1.3	Some Other Race	9
2.3.1.4	Two or More Races.....	9
2.3.1.5	American Indians and Alaskan Natives.....	9
2.3.1.6	Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders	9
2.3.2	Ethnic Minority (Hispanic) Concentrations.....	9
2.3.3	Low-Income Populations	14
2.4	NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS	14
2.4.1	Racial Minority Concentrations.....	18
2.4.1.1	Blacks.....	18
2.4.1.2	Asians.....	18
2.4.2	Ethnic Minority (Hispanic) Concentrations.....	18
2.4.3	Low Income Population Concentrations.....	18
2.5	US DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD STAMP INFORMATION	19
2.6	US DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT SECTION 8 HOUSING INFORMATION	19
3	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PUBLIC OUTREACH ACTIVITIES	22
3.1	MINORITY AND ETHNIC POPULATIONS.....	23
3.2	LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS	24

US 64 - NC 49 Strategic Highway Corridor Study Environmental Justice Technical Memorandum

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendices

- Appendix A 2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data**
- Appendix B 2000 US Census Income Data**
- Appendix C National Center for Education Statistics Data**
- Appendix D Business Establishments Accepting USDA Food Stamps**

List of Figures

Figure 2-1	Environmental Justice Study Area.....	4
Figure 2-2	Black Population Concentrations.....	8
Figure 2-3	Hispanic Population Concentrations.....	15
Figure 2-4	Low-Income Population Concentrations	17

List of Tables

Table 2-1	EJ Population Categories	3
Table 2-2	Minority Concentrations	6
Table 2-3	Notable Concentrations of Black Population.....	7
Table 2-4	Notable Concentrations of Persons of Some Other Race	11
Table 2-5	Hispanic Population Concentration	13
Table 2-6	Low-Income Population Concentration.....	16
Table 2-7	2004 HHS Federal Poverty Guidelines.....	20
Table 2-8	Number of Businesses Accepting Food Stamps within the EJ Study Area by County	21

1 Introduction

1.1 *Environmental Justice Populations Defined*

In 1994, concern that minority populations and/or low-income populations bear a disproportionate high and adverse human health or environmental effects led President Clinton to issue Executive Order 12898. The Executive Order directed federal agencies, including the FHWA, to make Environmental Justice (EJ) part of their mission by identifying and addressing the effects of all programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations. Executive Order 12898 and the USDOT and FHWA Orders on Environmental Justice address persons belonging to any of the following groups:

- Black - a person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.
- Hispanic - a person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.
- Asian - a person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent.
- American Indian and Alaskan Native - a person having origins in any of the original people of North America and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.
- Low-Income - a person whose household income (or in the case of a community or group, whose median household income) is at or below the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) poverty guidelines.

On March 9, 2000, the Office of Management and Budget issued its Bulletin No. 00-02, "Guidance on Aggregation and Allocation of Data on Race for Use in Civil Rights Monitoring and Enforcement," that added to the previous standard delineations of race/ethnicity the category of:

- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander - a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.

1.2 *Purpose and Organization of Report*

The purpose of this report is to identify specific areas along the corridor where concentrations of EJ populations exist and methods and techniques to outreach to these populations.

The report is organized as follows:

- Section 2 provides a summary of the existing EJ populations along the defined US 64-NC 49 Corridor.
- Section 3 provides recommended public outreach techniques based on the EJ population characteristics within the corridor.

2 Environmental Justice Populations

2.1 Data Sources

Several data sources were used to identify the EJ populations within the US 64-NC 49 Corridor. The primary data source for identifying minority and low-income populations is the 2000 US Census data. While generally recognized as the best source for population and socioeconomic data for a given area, one of its drawbacks is that the information is four to five years old and may no longer represent the existing conditions within the corridor. Therefore, other data sources that were more recently collected have been used to supplement the US Census data. These sources include the following:

- US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (Minority and Low-income information from the 2002-2003 school year)
- US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food Stamps Information (Low-income) (Current as of October 14, 2004)
- US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Section 8 Housing Information (Low-income) (Current as of October 14, 2004)

To correlate with the data sources compiled for this report, EJ populations have been categorized as shown in **Table 2-1**.

2.2 Environmental Justice Study Area Description

The regional study area for the US 64-NC 49 Corridor Study encompasses a total of 19 counties in central North Carolina and is based on regional travel characteristics. However, potential impacts to EJ populations are much more localized and, therefore, a more concise study area was needed for this analysis.


Because the primary data source for population and socioeconomic data is the 2000 US Census, the census tracts containing areas within three miles of either side of US 64 and NC 49 serve as the study area for this analysis. Therefore, the EJ study area includes 117 census tracts traversing eleven counties. The EJ study area in relation to the regional study area is shown in **Figure 2-1**.

Table 2-1
EJ Population Categories

Category	Population Group(s)
Racial Minority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blacks • Asians • American Indian and Alaskan Natives • Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islanders • Other Races • Two or More Races
Ethnic Minority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hispanics
Low-Income	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persons Living Below the Poverty Level • Persons Receiving Free and Reduced Price Meals from the US Department of Education* • Persons Receiving Food Stamps from USDA* • Persons Receiving Section 8 Housing Assistance from HUD

* Eligibility for these services is based on the HHS poverty guidelines and is administered by the USDA.

Environmental Justice Study Area



US 64 - NC 49 Corridor Study
Environmental Justice
Technical Memorandum



LEGEND

- Regional Study Area Boundary
- Environmental Justice Study Area

Figure 2-1

2.3 2000 US Census Data

The following sets of 2000 US Census data were used for this analysis:

- Race population by census tract
- Hispanic population by census tract
- Persons living below the poverty level

2.3.1 Racial Minority Concentrations

The 2000 US Census data collected for the EJ study area reveals that Blacks are the largest racial minority with 114,157 members. However, the concentration of Blacks and also American Indians and Alaskan Natives was lower within the EJ study area than North Carolina as a whole. Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders, and “Two or more races” had concentrations equal to the state. The two racial minorities with higher concentrations of population within the EJ study area than the state as a whole were Asians and those classified by the 2000 US Census as “Some Other Race.” A complete data set of the 2000 US Census race and ethnicity data collected for this report is provided in **Appendix A**. For the purpose of this report, a “concentration” is defined as the statewide average of a specific population.

The overall minority concentrations within the corridor are shown in **Table 2-2**.

2.3.1.1 Blacks

The statewide concentration for Blacks in North Carolina was 21.6 percent. Of the 117 census tracts in the EJ Study area, 33 had concentrations of greater than 21.6 percent and eight of those tracts had concentrations of over 50 percent. Because of the dominance of Blacks as a racial minority population, the concentration of Blacks within these census tracts is shown in **Table 2-3** and represented graphically in **Figure 2-2**.

As shown in **Table 2-3**, the highest concentrations of Blacks within the EJ study area are in Mecklenburg County, where all but two census tracts have concentrations equal to or greater than 21.6 percent. Furthermore, seven of the eight census tracts with concentrations over 50 percent are also located in Mecklenburg County. Other noteworthy Black population concentrations included those within urbanized areas in and around Concord, Lexington, Siler City, Asheboro, and Cary.

2.3.1.2 Asians

Of the 748,614 persons residing within the EJ study area, 20,779 are Asians. For the purposes of this analysis, a concentration of Asians was defined as 1.4 percent or greater. There were a total of 59 census tracts within the EJ study area with Asian concentrations that meet this threshold. Of these, a total of 24 tracts contain Asian concentrations of over five percent and three tracts contain concentrations of over ten percent.

**Table 2-2
Minority Concentrations**

		US 64-NC 49 EJ Study Area	North Carolina
Blacks	Population	114,157	1,737,545
	Percentage	15.2%	21.6%
American Indians and Alaskan Natives	Population	2,689	99,551
	Percentage	0.4%	1.2%
Asians	Population	20,779	113,689
	Percentage	2.8%	1.4%
Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders	Population	230	3,983
	Percentage	0.0%	0.0%
Some other race alone	Population	21,809	186,629
	Percentage	2.9%	2.3%
Two or more races	Population	10,031	103,260
	Percentage	1.3%	1.3%
Total Population		748,614	8,049,313


Source: 2000 US Census

**Table 2-3
Notable Concentrations of Black Population**

Census Tract, County	Total Population within Tract	Black Population	Percentage
Census Tract 418, Cabarrus	383	123	32.1%
Census Tract 419, Cabarrus	6,241	1,626	26.1%
Census Tract 421, Cabarrus	6,482	2,752	42.5%
Census Tract 203, Chatham	2,681	679	25.3%
Census Tract 206, Chatham	4,707	1,079	22.9%
Census Tract 208, Chatham	6,832	1,585	23.2%
Census Tract 614, Davidson	3,663	1,622	44.3%
Census Tract 615, Davidson	6,556	2,772	42.3%
Census Tract 602, Iredell	2,089	1,627	77.9%
Census Tract 603, Iredell	3,327	1,683	50.6%
Census Tract 604, Iredell	4,493	1,816	40.4%
Census Tract 605, Iredell	4,012	1,018	25.4%
Census Tract 13, Mecklenburg	4,319	2,052	47.5%
Census Tract 14, Mecklenburg	2,656	1,408	53.0%
Census Tract 15.03, Mecklenburg	9,191	4,071	44.3%
Census Tract 15.04, Mecklenburg	4,806	3,188	66.3%
Census Tract 15.05, Mecklenburg	2,906	684	23.5%
Census Tract 15.06, Mecklenburg	6,423	5,016	78.1%
Census Tract 51, Mecklenburg	2,628	2,291	87.2%
Census Tract 53.01, Mecklenburg	2,773	1,525	55.0%
Census Tract 53.03, Mecklenburg	6,970	5,573	80.0%
Census Tract 53.04, Mecklenburg	6,393	3,007	47.0%
Census Tract 54.02, Mecklenburg	6,588	3,822	58.0%
Census Tract 55.04, Mecklenburg	6,924	2,137	30.9%
Census Tract 55.07, Mecklenburg	10,240	2,842	27.8%
Census Tract 56.03, Mecklenburg	6,373	1,691	26.5%
Census Tract 56.04, Mecklenburg	5,007	1,313	26.2%
Census Tract 56.05, Mecklenburg	3,591	805	22.4%
Census Tract 56.06, Mecklenburg	5,720	1,854	32.4%
Census Tract 56.07, Mecklenburg	6,653	1,834	27.6%
Census Tract 303.02, Randolph	3,264	1,577	48.3%
Census Tract 511, Wake	1,388	692	49.9%
Census Tract 523.02, Wake	4,631	1,293	27.9%

Source: 2000 US Census

Black Population Concentrations



US 64 - NC 49 Corridor Study
 Environmental Justice
 Technical Memorandum

LEGEND

- Regional Study Area Boundary
- Black Population**
(% of Census Tract Population)
- 0 - 9.9%
- 10 - 19.9%
- 20 - 29.9%
- 30 - 39.9%
- 40% or above

Figure 2-2

Map not to scale

Of the 59 tracts with noteworthy Asian populations, 43 tracts are located in either Wake or Mecklenburg County. All of the Asian concentrations of greater than or equal to five percent are located in Mecklenburg and Wake counties in the urbanized areas of Charlotte, Cary and Apex.

2.3.1.3 Some Other Race

The statewide concentration of “some other race” was 2.3 percent, lower than the 2.9 percent within the EJ study area. When comparing the racial minority data to that of ethnic minorities, there was a high correlation between the concentration of those of Some Other Race and Hispanics. This correlation is demonstrated in **Table 2-4**.

A total of 49 census tracts along the corridor had concentrations of Some Other Race of 2.3 percent or greater. Of these tracts, 24 had concentrations of over five percent with five of these having concentrations of over ten percent.

As demonstrated in **Table 2-4**, the locations of concentrations of those of Some Other Race can be found throughout the entire length of the corridor, with the largest concentrations being located in Mecklenburg, Randolph, Cabarrus, and Chatham counties.

2.3.1.4 Two or More Races

The statewide and EJ study area concentrations for “two or more races” was 1.3 percent. Of the 117 census tracts with the EJ study area, 63 had concentrations of 1.3 and greater. Seventeen of those had concentrations of 2.0 to 2.9 percent and three census tracts had concentrations of 3.0 to 3.3 percent.

2.3.1.5 American Indians and Alaskan Natives

The state wide concentration in North Carolina was 1.2 percent for American Indians and Alaskan Natives. Only one of the 117 census tracts within the EJ study area had a concentration equal to or greater than the statewide average. This census tract was located in Wake County.

2.3.1.6 Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders

Both the statewide and EJ study area concentrations were 0.0 percent for Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders. Twenty-two of the 117 census tracts had a concentration from 0.1 to 1.0 percent and only one census tract had a concentration above 1.0 percent. This census tract was located in Wake County.

2.3.2 Ethnic Minority (Hispanic) Concentrations

Based on empirical data and field observations, the primary ethnic group within the EJ study area is Hispanics. The federal government considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Origin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality group,

lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of any race. The two most frequently identified racial groups for Hispanics were "some other race alone" (48.0 percent) and "white alone" (43.1 percent). The populations of Hispanics and other racial minority groups must be analyzed separately because some Hispanics may also be of a racial minority group. For example, as demonstrated in **Table 2-4**, there is a high correlation between the concentration of Hispanics and those of Some Other Race. However, those of Some Other Race are not exclusively Hispanics.

The concentration of Hispanics within the EJ study area is shown in **Table 2-5**.

The EJ study area had a slightly higher concentration of Hispanics than the state as a whole. In recognition of the statewide concentration of 4.7 percent, any census tract with concentrations over this ratio was considered to have a notable concentration of Hispanics. Forty-nine of the census tracts within the EJ study area have concentrations that exceed the state average. Of these, 21 tracts have concentrations of ten percent or greater and five have concentrations of 20 percent or greater.

**Table 2-4
Notable Concentrations of Persons of Some Other Race**

Census Tract, County	Total Population within Tract	Some Other Race Population within Tract	Percentage	Hispanics Population within Tract	Percentage
Census Tract 419, Cabarrus	6,241	549	8.8%	1,196	19.2%
Census Tract 421, Cabarrus	6,482	551	8.5%	1,103	17.0%
Census Tract 423, Cabarrus	4,522	182	4.0%	432	9.6%
Census Tract 424, Cabarrus	7,487	179	2.4%	669	8.9%
Census Tract 202, Chatham	6,282	162	2.6%	369	5.9%
Census Tract 203, Chatham	2,681	139	5.2%	207	7.7%
Census Tract 204, Chatham	9,159	2,102	23.0%	3,129	34.2%
Census Tract 613, Davidson	2,443	138	5.6%	177	7.2%
Census Tract 614, Davidson	3,663	320	8.7%	501	13.7%
Census Tract 615, Davidson	6,556	298	4.5%	676	10.3%
Census Tract 616, Davidson	2,879	196	6.8%	402	14.0%
Census Tract 805, Davie	3,604	118	3.3%	274	7.6%
Census Tract 601, Iredell	5,260	184	3.5%	394	7.5%
Census Tract 602, Iredell	2,089	108	5.2%	179	8.6%
Census Tract 603, Iredell	3,327	192	5.8%	358	10.8%
Census Tract 604, Iredell	4,493	248	5.5%	463	10.3%
Census Tract 605, Iredell	4,012	98	2.4%	163	4.1%
Census Tract 610, Iredell	9,418	292	3.1%	450	4.8%
Census Tract 13, Mecklenburg	4,319	166	3.8%	321	7.4%
Census Tract 14, Mecklenburg	2,656	93	3.5%	168	6.3%
Census Tract 15.03, Mecklenburg	9,191	1,101	12.0%	1,756	19.1%
Census Tract 15.04, Mecklenburg	4,806	167	3.5%	297	6.2%
Census Tract 15.05, Mecklenburg	2,906	213	7.3%	332	11.4%
Census Tract 15.06, Mecklenburg	6,423	152	2.4%	247	3.8%
Census Tract 53.01, Mecklenburg	2,773	351	12.7%	625	22.5%
Census Tract 53.03, Mecklenburg	6,970	410	5.9%	566	8.1%
Census Tract 53.04, Mecklenburg	6,393	2,174	34.0%	2,831	44.3%
Census Tract 55.04, Mecklenburg	6,924	288	4.2%	437	6.3%
Census Tract 56.03, Mecklenburg	6,373	155	2.4%	510	8.0%
Census Tract 56.05, Mecklenburg	3,591	102	2.8%	202	5.6%
Census Tract 301, Randolph	4,498	478	10.6%	967	21.5%
Census Tract 302.01, Randolph	3,221	231	7.2%	496	15.4%
Census Tract 302.02, Randolph	4,946	452	9.1%	774	15.6%
Census Tract 303.01, Randolph	5,319	408	7.7%	1394	26.2%
Census Tract 303.02, Randolph	3,264	232	7.1%	613	18.8%
Census Tract 304, Randolph	3,896	274	7.0%	706	18.1%
Census Tract 305.02, Randolph	3,717	92	2.5%	152	4.1%
Census Tract 306, Randolph	5,753	160	2.8%	214	3.7%

Source: 2000 US Census

**Table 2-4
Notable Concentrations of Persons of Some Other Race (continued)**

Census Tract, County	Total Population within Tract	Some Other Race Population within Tract	Percentage	Hispanics Population within Tract	Percentage
Census Tract 310, Randolph	6,801	313	4.6%	566	8.3%
Census Tract 311, Randolph	5,960	213	3.6%	382	6.4%
Census Tract 314, Randolph	6,224	187	3.0%	537	8.6%
Census Tract 511, Wake	1,388	85	6.1%	108	7.8%
Census Tract 524.02, Wake	8,749	588	6.7%	1,310	15.0%
Census Tract 524.05, Wake	13,179	432	3.3%	934	7.1%
Census Tract 530.02, Wake	9,878	271	2.7%	504	5.1%
Census Tract 535.01, Wake	7,458	538	7.2%	1034	13.9%
Census Tract 535.08, Wake	8,327	233	2.8%	929	11.2%

Source: 2000 US Census

**Table 2-5
Hispanic Population Concentration**

		US 64-NC 49 EJ Study Area	North Carolina
Hispanic	Population	43,683	378,963
	Percentage	5.8%	4.7%
Non-Hispanic	Population	704,931	7,670,350
	Percentage	94.2%	95.3%
Total Population		748,614	8,049,313

Source: 2000 US Census

The distribution of Hispanic populations within the EJ study area was fairly widespread. Rowan and Stanly were the only counties within the EJ study area that did not have a census tract with a Hispanic concentration greater than the statewide average. The largest concentrations of Hispanics were located in Mecklenburg, Randolph, Chatham and Cabarrus counties in the urbanized areas of Charlotte, Asheboro, Siler City, and Concord. The concentration of Hispanics populations within the EJ study area is shown on **Figure 2-3**.

2.3.3 Low-Income Populations

As noted in Section 1.1, Executive Order 12898 defines low-income EJ populations as those living below the poverty guidelines established by the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The 2000 US Census neither determines poverty in the same manner as HHS, nor determines the poverty level on an annual basis like HHS. However, many that would be considered below the poverty level by the 2000 US Census would likely meet the HHS thresholds as low-income. The concentration of persons living below the poverty level within the corridor is shown below in **Table 2-6**. A complete data set of the 2000 US Census income data collected for this report is provided in **Appendix B**.


As shown, the EJ study area had a lower concentration of persons living below the poverty level than the state as a whole. Any census tract with concentrations over the statewide average of 12.3 percent was considered to have a notable concentration of low-income populations. Of the 117 census tracts within the EJ study area, 38 have concentrations that exceed the state average. Of these, 15 tracts have concentrations of 20 percent or greater and five of these have concentrations of 30 percent or greater.

The distribution of persons living below the poverty level within the EJ study area was fairly widespread. Only Rowan and Stanly counties within the EJ study area did not have a census tract with a concentration of those living at or below the poverty level greater than the statewide average. The largest concentrations of low-income population are located in Mecklenburg, Iredell, Wake, Davidson and Randolph counties. The concentration of persons living below the poverty level within the EJ study area is shown on **Figure 2-4**.

2.4 National Center for Education Statistics

The US Department of Education compiles a variety of statistics for every public school in the United States on an annual basis within its National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The statistical information compiled includes racial composition, Hispanic enrollment, and the number of students on the Free and Reduced Price Meal programs. For the purposes of this analysis, statistics for elementary schools along the corridor were used because, unlike high schools and junior high schools, their attendance zones are smaller areas and are more reflective of the characteristics of a specific area. As such, these statistics provide a means of supplementing the data from the 2000 US Census, which is four to five years old. Data from 36 elementary schools within the EJ study area was utilized for this analysis. The most recent data available for this analysis was from the 2002-2003 school year. A complete set of NCES data for these schools is provided in **Appendix C**.

Hispanic Population Concentrations



US 64 - NC 49 Corridor Study
Environmental Justice
Technical Memorandum



LEGEND


-  Regional Study Area Boundary
- Hispanic Population**
(% of Census Tract Population)
-  0 - 4.9%
-  5 - 14.9%
-  15 - 24.9%
-  25 - 34.9%
-  35% or above

Figure 2-3

Map not to scale

**Table 2-6
Low-Income Population Concentration***


		US 64-NC 49 EJ Study Area	North Carolina
Below Poverty Level	Population	66,431	958,667
	Percentage	9.1%	12.3%
At or Above Poverty Level	Population	661,972	6,846,661
	Percentage	90.9%	87.7%
Total Population		728,403	7,805,328

Source: 2000 US Census

* Universe-population for whom poverty status is determined (sample survey.)

The total population figures above for the EJ study area and North Carolina do not match those shown in Tables 2-2 and 2-5 because of the different ways the US Census collected race and poverty data. Racial data (Tables 2-2 and 2-5) is found in Summary File 1 (SF1) and is 100-percent data. This comes from the short forms. Poverty data (Table 2-6) is found in Summary File 3 (SF3) and is sample data. Sample data is collected on long forms. The responses from the sample of households reporting on the long forms must be weighted to reflect the entire population. Specifically, each responding household represents, on average, six or seven other households who reported using short forms. Therefore, total population figures between Summary Files can not be directly compared.

Low-Income Population Concentrations



US 64 - NC 49 Corridor Study
Environmental Justice
Technical Memorandum



LEGEND

-  Regional Study Area Boundary
- Low Income**
(% of Census Tract Population)
-  0 - 4.9%
-  5 - 9.9%
-  10 - 19.9%
-  20 - 29.9%
-  30% or above

Figure 2-4

Map not to scale

It should be noted that NCES data only addresses children and, therefore, does not reflect the characteristics of those within a specific area that do not have children or those with children that are older and/or are enrolled in private schools.

2.4.1 Racial Minority Concentrations

Pursuant to the NCES data, the two most prevalent racial minority concentrations within the schools in the EJ study area are Blacks and Asians. Native American attendance exceeded 1.0 percent at only one school.

2.4.1.1 Blacks

Of the 38 elementary schools within the corridor, 15 were characterized with Black student concentrations of 20 percent or more. The schools with the greatest concentration were located in Charlotte and the urbanized areas of Lexington, Siler City, Asheboro, Cary and Pittsboro. The smallest concentrations of Blacks were in the schools in rural areas of Davidson and Randolph Counties. These concentrations for Blacks are consistent with those found in the 2000 US Census data.

2.4.1.2 Asians

The schools with the largest concentrations of Asians were located in Wake, Mecklenburg, and Davidson Counties. The largest concentration of Asian student enrollment was found at Pickett Primary in Lexington, which was 11.3 percent. However, most of the schools with higher concentrations of Asians were located in the Wake County communities of Cary and Apex or in Charlotte. The lowest concentrations of Asian student enrollment were located in Siler City, Asheboro, Mocksville, and Denton. These concentrations are consistent with those of the overall Asian populations reflected in the 2000 US Census data.

2.4.2 Ethnic Minority (Hispanic) Concentrations

Pursuant to the NCES, there are 15 elementary schools within the EJ study area with Hispanic student concentrations of greater than 10 percent. The largest concentration of Hispanic students is at Siler City Elementary School in Siler City, with an enrollment that is 57.0 percent Hispanic. Also, four of the seven elementary schools within Asheboro have Hispanic student concentrations that are greater than 15 percent and two have concentrations greater than thirty percent. Concentrations of Hispanic students were also found in elementary schools in Ramseur, Charlotte, Lexington, Cary and Concord. Much like the 2000 US Census data, the NCES data would indicate a widespread distribution of Hispanics throughout the EJ study area with higher concentrations found in Chatham and Randolph Counties.

2.4.3 Low Income Population Concentrations

The NCES measure for low-income student populations used for this analysis was the number of students within the Free and Reduced Price Meals programs. Of the 36 elementary schools along the corridor, 18 had enrollments with at least 30 percent of their students

receiving Free and Reduced Price Meals. Six of these schools had over one-half of their students receiving Free and Reduced Price Meals. The largest concentration of Free and Reduced Price Meals recipients was found at Siler City Elementary, with 82.6 percent. Another significant concentration of recipients was found at Pickett Primary in Lexington, where 80.6 percent of their students received Free and Reduced Price Meals. All nine of the elementary schools within Randolph County, which includes Asheboro and Ramseur, had over 30 percent of their students receiving Free and Reduced Price Meals. Other areas with high percentages of students receiving Free and Reduced Price Meals include Charlotte, Denton, and Mocksville. It should be noted that eligibility for the Free and Reduced Price Meals program is based upon the poverty guidelines of the HHS, which defines low-income populations under Executive Order 12898. These guidelines are presented in **Table 2-7**.

2.5 US Department of Agriculture Food Stamp Information

The US Department of Agriculture (USDA) is the agency responsible for the administration of food stamps to low-income families. The number of business establishments that accept USDA food stamps within a certain area is an indicator of low-income populations. Eligibility for USDA food stamps is also based upon the HHS poverty guidelines, which define low-income populations under Executive Order 12898, presented in **Table 2-7**.

The following is the number of establishments that accept USDA food stamps in each of the zip codes along the EJ study by county. A complete list of these establishments is provided in **Appendix D**.

As **Table 2-8** demonstrates, establishments that accept USDA food stamps are located throughout the EJ study area.

2.6 US Department of Housing and Urban Development Section 8 Housing Information

In order to further supplement the location of low-income households, a search for subsidized housing was conducted on the web site (<http://www.hud.gov/apps/section8/results.cfm>) for the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). HUD is required by law to set income limits that determine the eligibility of applicants for HUD's assisted housing programs. The major active assisted housing programs are the Public Housing program, the Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments program, and Section 202 housing for the elderly and Section 811 housing for persons with disabilities. Income limits are calculated for metropolitan areas and non-metropolitan counties in the United States and its territories using the Fair Market Rent (FMR) area definitions used in the Section 8 program. They are based on HUD estimates of median family income, with adjustments for family size. Adjustments are also made for areas that have unusually high or low income to housing cost relationships. The key excerpts relevant to income limits may be summarized as follows:

**Table 2-7
2004 HHS Federal Poverty Guidelines**

Number in Family	Gross Yearly Income	Gross Monthly Income	Approximate Hourly Income
1	\$9,570	\$798	\$4.60
2	\$12,830	\$1,069	\$6.17
3	\$16,090	\$1,341	\$7.74
4	\$19,350	\$1,613	\$9.30
5	\$22,610	\$1,884	\$10.87
6	\$25,870	\$2,156	\$12.44
7	\$29,130	\$2,428	\$14.00
8	\$32,390	\$2,699	\$15.57
Over 8 add for each person	+\$3,260	+\$272	+\$1.57

Source: US Department of Health and Human Services, 2005, <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/05poverty.shtml> (48 contiguous states)

Table 2-8
Number of Businesses Accepting Food Stamps within the EJ Study Area by County

County	City/Town	Zip Code	Number of Establishments
Cabarrus	Concord	28025	17
	Concord	28027	5
	Harrisburg	28075	2
	Mount Pleasant	28124	2
Chatham	Pittsboro	27312	4
	Siler City	27344	7
Davidson	Denton	27239	3
	Lexington	27292	26
Davie	Advance	27006	3
	Mocksville	27028	9
Iredell	Statesville	28625	6
	Harmony	28634	1
Mecklenburg	Charlotte	28213	11
	Charlotte	28262	4
Randolph	Asheboro	27203	15
	Ramseur	27316	3
	Trinity	27370	2
Rowan	Cleveland	27013	2
Stanly	New London	28127	1
	Richfield	28137	2
Wake	Apex	27502	10
	Cary	27511	14
	Raleigh	27606	8

Source: US Department of Agriculture, 2004

- Low-income families are defined as families whose incomes do not exceed 80 percent of the median family income for the area.
- Very low-income families are defined as families whose incomes do not exceed 50 percent of the median family income for the area.
- The 1998 Act amendments establish a 30 percent of median family income program targeting standard.
- Income limits for non-metropolitan areas may not be less than limits based on the State non-metropolitan median family income level.
- Income limits are adjusted for family size.
- Income limits are adjusted for areas with unusually high or low family income or housing-cost-to-income relationships.
- The Secretary of Agriculture is to be consulted prior to establishing income limits for rural areas, since these limits also apply to certain Rural Housing and Community Development Service programs.

According to HUD, the following cities within the EJ study area have subsidized housing units:

- Charlotte
- Concord
- Lexington
- Asheboro
- Cary
- Siler City
- Mocksville
- Statesville
- Ramseur

Both 2000 US Census and NCES data indicate the presence of low-income population concentrations within these areas.

3 Recommendations for Public Outreach Activities

Often the constraints and abilities of minority and low-income populations to participate in public involvement are the same. While the 2000 US Census found that a greater number of whites were considered low-income than any of the individual minority and ethnic populations, a higher percent of the individual minority and ethnic populations were considered low-income than whites. A strong correlation between poverty and low literacy was identified in the National Adult Literacy Survey, conducted by the US Department of Education in 1992. This survey found that 43 percent of adults (those 16 years old and older) with Level 1 literacy skills (reading below 5th grade level) were living in poverty. It also found that the likelihood of being on welfare goes up as literacy skills go down. Seventy-five percent of all Food Stamp recipients (a US Department of Agriculture program which uses HHS poverty guidelines) had Level 1 and Level 2 literacy skills. Level 2 literacy skills

are defined as reading between 5th and 7th grade level. As identified in the "State of Literacy in America: Estimates at the Local, State and National Levels" (US Department of Education, National Institute for Literacy, 1998), the Level 1 literacy rates for the 10 counties that compose the EJ study area range from 15 percent (Randolph County) to 22 percent (Chatham County). As defined by the National Literacy Act (1991), literacy is "An individual's ability to read, write, and speak in English, and compute and solve problems at levels of proficiency necessary to function on the job and in society, to achieve one's goals, and develop one's knowledge and potential". Since many of those considered to be minority and low-income have limited English proficiency, federal and state agencies had been directed to "take reasonable steps to ensure 'meaningful' access to information and services" (Executive Order 13166). In some cases this can be interpreted as meaning information that must be presented in a language other than English and/or at a reading level reflective of their level of literacy.

3.1 Minority and Ethnic Populations

Based on the research documented in Section 2, the following describes minority and ethnic populations within the EJ study area:

- The three primary minority and ethnic environmental justice populations within the US 64-NC 49 Corridor are Blacks, Asians, and Hispanics.
- Notable concentrations of blacks reside in Charlotte and smaller areas of Lexington, Asheboro, Siler City, Cary and Pittsboro.
- Hispanics populations are widespread throughout the EJ study area, with the largest concentrations located in Siler City and Asheboro.
- All of the Asian concentrations of greater than five percent were located in Mecklenburg and Wake Counties in the urbanized areas of Charlotte, Cary and Apex.
- There are very few Native Americans within the EJ study area.

Therefore, a successful public involvement program that would mitigate potential environmental justice impacts is one that would target participation from African-Americans, Hispanics and, to a lesser degree, Asians. Potential strategies to reach these populations include the following:

- In recognition that these populations may have low literacy and limited English proficiency, appearing on minority radio and television programs.
- Advertising within the racial and ethnic print and electronic media. Advertisements targeting Hispanic participation would need to be in Spanish.
- Soliciting speaking engagements at local churches, civic groups and neighborhood associations.
- Piggybacking on existing events, fairs, and sports activities.
- Working with local merchants to set up project input stations at frequented business establishments such as grocery stores, discount stores, barber shops, etc.
- Working with local schools to distribute information about the project to students for them to bring home.

- Conducting public meetings at convenient times and places where these populations feel comfortable.
- Including Spanish-speaking staff to assist Hispanics and make them feel welcome at public outreach events.
- Creating presentations that are predominantly graphic and not written.

3.2 Low-Income Populations

Based on the research documented in Section 2, the following describes low-income populations within the EJ study area:

- The EJ study area had a lower concentration of persons living at or below the poverty level than the state as a whole.
- The distribution of persons living below the poverty level along the US 64-NC 49 Corridor is fairly widespread. The largest concentrations of low-income population along the corridor are located in Mecklenburg, Iredell, Wake, Davidson and Randolph counties.
- Only one of the census tracts characterized by notable concentrations of low-income populations was not characterized by a notable minority population, which would indicate the presence of low-income whites. This tract is located in Davie County.

Because nearly all of the low-income areas within the EJ study area are located within minority or ethnically populated areas, all of the strategies targeting minorities would likely apply to the low-income populations within the EJ study area. Potential public involvement strategies specifically targeted to attract low-income persons include the following:

- Working with local schools to identify low-income populations through the free and reduced price meals program.
- Working with social service agencies to understand the social and employment trends within a given area and to validate the identification of low-income populations.
- In recognizing that many low-income persons work nontraditional work hours, have limited personal transportation, do not own computers, or subscribe to newspapers, public outreach events should be scheduled accordingly to reach the greatest percentage of these populations.
- Offering or raffling free giveaways at public outreach activities to draw interest.

Appendix A

2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data

Appendix A
2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data

White, Black, Asian and Some Other Race

Census Tract	County	Total Population	White		Black		Asian		Some Other Race	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
405	CABARRUS	7,134	6,560	92.0%	366	5.1%	45	0.6%	81	1.1%
406	CABARRUS	5,238	5,024	95.9%	104	2.0%	29	0.6%	13	0.2%
415	CABARRUS	10,852	9,835	90.6%	751	6.9%	110	1.0%	28	0.3%
416	CABARRUS	8,028	7,431	92.6%	399	5.0%	18	0.2%	65	0.8%
417	CABARRUS	6,685	6,284	94.0%	301	4.5%	26	0.4%	20	0.3%
418	CABARRUS	383	253	66.1%	123	32.1%	4	1.0%	0	0.0%
419	CABARRUS	6,241	3,885	62.2%	1,626	26.1%	28	0.4%	549	8.8%
420	CABARRUS	4,723	3,834	81.2%	660	14.0%	48	1.0%	105	2.2%
421	CABARRUS	6,482	3,042	46.9%	2,752	42.5%	28	0.4%	551	8.5%
422	CABARRUS	5,644	5,257	93.1%	247	4.4%	38	0.7%	62	1.1%
423	CABARRUS	4,522	3,485	77.1%	772	17.1%	19	0.4%	182	4.0%
424	CABARRUS	7,487	6,131	81.9%	884	11.8%	156	2.1%	179	2.4%
425	CABARRUS	8,540	7,563	88.6%	649	7.6%	138	1.6%	89	1.0%
426	CABARRUS	13,594	12,291	90.4%	742	5.5%	218	1.6%	173	1.3%
201	CHATHAM	10,457	8,823	84.4%	1,199	11.5%	115	1.1%	173	1.7%
202	CHATHAM	6,282	5,106	81.3%	904	14.4%	16	0.3%	162	2.6%
203	CHATHAM	2,681	1,802	67.2%	679	25.3%	15	0.6%	139	5.2%
204	CHATHAM	9,159	4,883	53.3%	1,918	20.9%	55	0.6%	2,102	23.0%
206	CHATHAM	4,707	3,529	75.0%	1,079	22.9%	6	0.1%	47	1.0%
207	CHATHAM	5,612	4,646	82.8%	735	13.1%	54	1.0%	69	1.2%
208	CHATHAM	6,832	4,966	72.7%	1,585	23.2%	29	0.4%	129	1.9%
603	DAVIDSON	13,056	12,517	95.9%	328	2.5%	34	0.3%	52	0.4%
604	DAVIDSON	4,541	4,345	95.7%	96	2.1%	50	1.1%	16	0.4%
605	DAVIDSON	5,345	5,241	98.1%	31	0.6%	10	0.2%	20	0.4%
611	DAVIDSON	6,357	6,142	96.6%	133	2.1%	16	0.3%	23	0.4%
612	DAVIDSON	9,084	7,366	81.1%	746	8.2%	421	4.6%	295	3.2%
613	DAVIDSON	2,443	1,831	74.9%	327	13.4%	67	2.7%	138	5.6%

Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 US Census

Appendix A
2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data

White, Black, Asian and Some Other Race (continued)

Census Tract	County	Total Population	White		Black		Asian		Some Other Race	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
614	DAVIDSON	3,663	1,593	43.5%	1,622	44.3%	39	1.1%	320	8.7%
615	DAVIDSON	6,556	3,301	50.4%	2,772	42.3%	55	0.8%	298	4.5%
616	DAVIDSON	2,879	2,127	73.9%	421	14.6%	54	1.9%	196	6.8%
617	DAVIDSON	14,460	13,866	95.9%	329	2.3%	48	0.3%	60	0.4%
618.01	DAVIDSON	9,149	8,065	88.2%	810	8.9%	110	1.2%	51	0.6%
618.02	DAVIDSON	6,188	5,986	96.7%	78	1.3%	46	0.7%	35	0.6%
619	DAVIDSON	11,185	11,010	98.4%	48	0.4%	11	0.1%	28	0.3%
620	DAVIDSON	8,301	8,175	98.5%	26	0.3%	12	0.1%	21	0.3%
801	DAVIE	6,773	6,200	91.5%	386	5.7%	5	0.1%	114	1.7%
803	DAVIE	6,784	6,477	95.5%	186	2.7%	21	0.3%	33	0.5%
804	DAVIE	4,073	3,836	94.2%	182	4.5%	5	0.1%	18	0.4%
805	DAVIE	3,604	2,799	77.7%	606	16.8%	23	0.6%	118	3.3%
806	DAVIE	3,376	2,960	87.7%	278	8.2%	26	0.8%	63	1.9%
807	DAVIE	6,063	5,281	87.1%	605	10.0%	13	0.2%	79	1.3%
601	IREDELL	5,260	4,083	77.6%	830	15.8%	86	1.6%	184	3.5%
602	IREDELL	2,089	293	14.0%	1,627	77.9%	40	1.9%	108	5.2%
603	IREDELL	3,327	1,265	38.0%	1,683	50.6%	116	3.5%	192	5.8%
604	IREDELL	4,493	2,294	51.1%	1,816	40.4%	49	1.1%	248	5.5%
605	IREDELL	4,012	2,693	67.1%	1,018	25.4%	123	3.1%	98	2.4%
606	IREDELL	7,359	5,351	72.7%	1,560	21.2%	230	3.1%	139	1.9%
607	IREDELL	8,653	7,154	82.7%	1,091	12.6%	165	1.9%	116	1.3%
608	IREDELL	6,577	5,544	84.3%	789	12.0%	19	0.3%	131	2.0%
610	IREDELL	9,418	8,251	87.6%	600	6.4%	161	1.7%	292	3.1%
13	MECKLENBURG	4,319	1,804	41.8%	2,052	47.5%	180	4.2%	166	3.8%
14	MECKLENBURG	2,656	997	37.5%	1,408	53.0%	67	2.5%	93	3.5%
15.03	MECKLENBURG	9,191	3,468	37.7%	4,071	44.3%	298	3.2%	1,101	12.0%
15.04	MECKLENBURG	4,806	1,208	25.1%	3,188	66.3%	152	3.2%	167	3.5%

Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 US Census

Appendix A
2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data

White, Black, Asian and Some Other Race (continued)

Census Tract	County	Total Population	White		Black		Asian		Some Other Race	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
15.05	MECKLENBURG	2,906	1,835	63.1%	684	23.5%	87	3.0%	213	7.3%
15.06	MECKLENBURG	6,423	940	14.6%	5,016	78.1%	229	3.6%	152	2.4%
51	MECKLENBURG	2,628	126	4.8%	2,291	87.2%	91	3.5%	77	2.9%
53.01	MECKLENBURG	2,773	816	29.4%	1,525	55.0%	19	0.7%	351	12.7%
53.03	MECKLENBURG	6,970	829	11.9%	5,573	80.0%	57	0.8%	410	5.9%
53.04	MECKLENBURG	6,393	796	12.5%	3,007	47.0%	159	2.5%	2,174	34.0%
54.02	MECKLENBURG	6,588	2,207	33.5%	3,822	58.0%	338	5.1%	77	1.2%
55.04	MECKLENBURG	6,924	4,072	58.8%	2,137	30.9%	274	4.0%	288	4.2%
55.05	MECKLENBURG	9,327	6,978	74.8%	1,665	17.9%	463	5.0%	75	0.8%
55.06	MECKLENBURG	11,554	8,846	76.6%	1,917	16.6%	528	4.6%	92	0.8%
55.07	MECKLENBURG	10,240	6,215	60.7%	2,842	27.8%	820	8.0%	158	1.5%
56.03	MECKLENBURG	6,373	3,981	62.5%	1,691	26.5%	371	5.8%	155	2.4%
56.04	MECKLENBURG	5,007	3,241	64.7%	1,313	26.2%	230	4.6%	83	1.7%
56.05	MECKLENBURG	3,591	2,284	63.6%	805	22.4%	314	8.7%	102	2.8%
56.06	MECKLENBURG	5,720	3,323	58.1%	1,854	32.4%	359	6.3%	81	1.4%
56.07	MECKLENBURG	6,653	4,335	65.2%	1,834	27.6%	225	3.4%	111	1.7%
9603	MONTGOMERY	3,340	3,205	96.0%	25	0.7%	54	1.6%	8	0.2%
301	RANDOLPH	4,498	3,309	73.6%	443	9.8%	114	2.5%	478	10.6%
302.01	RANDOLPH	3,221	2,759	85.7%	141	4.4%	27	0.8%	231	7.2%
302.02	RANDOLPH	4,946	4,214	85.2%	129	2.6%	45	0.9%	452	9.1%
303.01	RANDOLPH	5,319	4,409	82.9%	278	5.2%	101	1.9%	408	7.7%
303.02	RANDOLPH	3,264	1,370	42.0%	1,577	48.3%	8	0.2%	232	7.1%
304	RANDOLPH	3,896	3,200	82.1%	315	8.1%	31	0.8%	274	7.0%
305.01	RANDOLPH	10,584	10,263	97.0%	129	1.2%	14	0.1%	57	0.5%
305.02	RANDOLPH	3,717	3,430	92.3%	133	3.6%	46	1.2%	92	2.5%
306	RANDOLPH	5,753	5,377	93.5%	112	1.9%	24	0.4%	160	2.8%
307	RANDOLPH	5,614	5,417	96.5%	40	0.7%	36	0.6%	81	1.4%

Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 US Census

Appendix A
2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data

White, Black, Asian and Some Other Race (continued)

Census Tract	County	Total Population	White		Black		Asian		Some Other Race	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
308.01	RANDOLPH	5,688	5,280	92.8%	259	4.6%	14	0.2%	80	1.4%
308.02	RANDOLPH	6,263	5,820	92.9%	253	4.0%	8	0.1%	98	1.6%
309	RANDOLPH	3,637	3,269	89.9%	287	7.9%	4	0.1%	33	0.9%
310	RANDOLPH	6,801	5,506	81.0%	842	12.4%	28	0.4%	313	4.6%
311	RANDOLPH	5,960	5,477	91.9%	177	3.0%	14	0.2%	213	3.6%
314	RANDOLPH	6,224	5,695	91.5%	231	3.7%	22	0.4%	187	3.0%
509.02	ROWAN	8,130	7,499	92.2%	459	5.6%	29	0.4%	64	0.8%
510.01	ROWAN	6,793	6,572	96.7%	78	1.1%	18	0.3%	53	0.8%
519.01	ROWAN	6,321	4,796	75.9%	1,274	20.2%	18	0.3%	131	2.1%
9901	STANLY	7,745	6,643	85.8%	935	12.1%	72	0.9%	24	0.3%
511	WAKE	1,388	513	37.0%	692	49.9%	37	2.7%	85	6.1%
523.01	WAKE	3,730	2,950	79.1%	291	7.8%	372	10.0%	54	1.4%
523.02	WAKE	4,631	2,782	60.1%	1,293	27.9%	368	7.9%	97	2.1%
524.01	WAKE	2,689	2,189	81.4%	275	10.2%	157	5.8%	28	1.0%
524.02	WAKE	8,749	5,974	68.3%	1,425	16.3%	457	5.2%	588	6.7%
524.04	WAKE	3,907	3,195	81.8%	332	8.5%	195	5.0%	70	1.8%
524.05	WAKE	13,179	8,785	66.7%	2,539	19.3%	1,004	7.6%	432	3.3%
530.01	WAKE	16,041	14,388	89.7%	384	2.4%	956	6.0%	79	0.5%
530.02	WAKE	9,878	8,046	81.5%	1,191	12.1%	154	1.6%	271	2.7%
534.02	WAKE	7,435	6,340	85.3%	255	3.4%	680	9.1%	48	0.6%
534.03	WAKE	17,410	14,672	84.3%	1,475	8.5%	690	4.0%	224	1.3%
534.04	WAKE	14,168	11,129	78.6%	2,104	14.9%	381	2.7%	282	2.0%
534.05	WAKE	3,818	3,359	88.0%	169	4.4%	220	5.8%	12	0.3%
534.06	WAKE	5,135	4,321	84.1%	213	4.1%	462	9.0%	44	0.9%
534.07	WAKE	6,195	4,769	77.0%	333	5.4%	964	15.6%	34	0.5%
535.01	WAKE	7,458	5,270	70.7%	888	11.9%	497	6.7%	538	7.2%
535.05	WAKE	3,824	3,413	89.3%	107	2.8%	209	5.5%	31	0.8%

Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 US Census

Appendix A
2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data

White, Black, Asian and Some Other Race (continued)

Census Tract	County	Total Population	White		Black		Asian		Some Other Race	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
535.06	WAKE	5,337	4,730	88.6%	234	4.4%	242	4.5%	38	0.7%
535.07	WAKE	3,069	2,608	85.0%	291	9.5%	78	2.5%	41	1.3%
535.08	WAKE	8,327	6,708	80.6%	684	8.2%	405	4.9%	233	2.8%
535.09	WAKE	5,049	4,732	93.7%	86	1.7%	174	3.4%	12	0.2%
535.10	WAKE	8,011	5,821	72.7%	835	10.4%	995	12.4%	138	1.7%
535.13	WAKE	3,475	2,475	71.2%	492	14.2%	321	9.2%	65	1.9%
535.14	WAKE	5,761	4,838	84.0%	363	6.3%	403	7.0%	20	0.3%
535.15	WAKE	5,406	4,633	85.7%	261	4.8%	363	6.7%	48	0.9%
536	WAKE	9,437	7,792	82.6%	634	6.7%	757	8.0%	98	1.0%
US 64-NC 49 Corridor		748,614	578,919	77.3%	114,157	15.2%	20,779	2.8%	21,908	2.9%
North Carolina		8,049,313	5,804,656	72.1%	1,737,545	21.6%	113,689	1.4%	186,629	2.3%

Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 US Census

Appendix A
2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data

American Indian and Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races

Census Tract	County	Total Population	American Indian and Alaska Native		Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		Two or More Races	
			#	%	#	%	#	%
405	CABARRUS	7,134	29	0.4%	4	0.1%	49	0.7%
406	CABARRUS	5,238	23	0.4%	4	0.1%	41	0.8%
415	CABARRUS	10,852	36	0.3%	1	0.0%	91	0.8%
416	CABARRUS	8,028	52	0.6%	3	0.0%	60	0.7%
417	CABARRUS	6,685	23	0.3%	3	0.0%	28	0.4%
418	CABARRUS	383	2	0.5%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%
419	CABARRUS	6,241	30	0.5%	0	0.0%	123	2.0%
420	CABARRUS	4,723	11	0.2%	0	0.0%	65	1.4%
421	CABARRUS	6,482	9	0.1%	6	0.1%	94	1.5%
422	CABARRUS	5,644	9	0.2%	0	0.0%	31	0.5%
423	CABARRUS	4,522	14	0.3%	0	0.0%	50	1.1%
424	CABARRUS	7,487	35	0.5%	2	0.0%	100	1.3%
425	CABARRUS	8,540	31	0.4%	1	0.0%	69	0.8%
426	CABARRUS	13,594	41	0.3%	4	0.0%	125	0.9%
201	CHATHAM	10,457	39	0.4%	1	0.0%	107	1.0%
202	CHATHAM	6,282	15	0.2%	0	0.0%	79	1.3%
203	CHATHAM	2,681	7	0.3%	1	0.0%	38	1.4%
204	CHATHAM	9,159	48	0.5%	13	0.1%	140	1.5%
206	CHATHAM	4,707	20	0.4%	0	0.0%	26	0.6%
207	CHATHAM	5,612	42	0.7%	1	0.0%	65	1.2%
208	CHATHAM	6,832	27	0.4%	2	0.0%	94	1.4%
603	DAVIDSON	13,056	47	0.4%	1	0.0%	77	0.6%
604	DAVIDSON	4,541	4	0.1%	0	0.0%	30	0.7%
605	DAVIDSON	5,345	22	0.4%	0	0.0%	21	0.4%
611	DAVIDSON	6,357	11	0.2%	0	0.0%	32	0.5%
612	DAVIDSON	9,084	33	0.4%	4	0.0%	219	2.4%

Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 US Census

Appendix A
2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data

American Indian and Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races (continued)

Census Tract	County	Total Population	American Indian and Alaska Native		Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		Two or More Races	
			#	%	#	%	#	%
613	DAVIDSON	2,443	17	0.7%	0	0.0%	63	2.6%
614	DAVIDSON	3,663	28	0.8%	8	0.2%	53	1.4%
615	DAVIDSON	6,556	17	0.3%	0	0.0%	113	1.7%
616	DAVIDSON	2,879	12	0.4%	1	0.0%	68	2.4%
617	DAVIDSON	14,460	54	0.4%	1	0.0%	102	0.7%
618.01	DAVIDSON	9,149	56	0.6%	0	0.0%	57	0.6%
618.02	DAVIDSON	6,188	13	0.2%	0	0.0%	30	0.5%
619	DAVIDSON	11,185	35	0.3%	0	0.0%	53	0.5%
620	DAVIDSON	8,301	25	0.3%	0	0.0%	42	0.5%
801	DAVIE	6,773	21	0.3%	0	0.0%	47	0.7%
803	DAVIE	6,784	11	0.2%	1	0.0%	55	0.8%
804	DAVIE	4,073	8	0.2%	0	0.0%	24	0.6%
805	DAVIE	3,604	9	0.2%	0	0.0%	49	1.4%
806	DAVIE	3,376	6	0.2%	3	0.1%	40	1.2%
807	DAVIE	6,063	16	0.3%	0	0.0%	69	1.1%
601	IREDELL	5,260	4	0.1%	3	0.1%	70	1.3%
602	IREDELL	2,089	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	19	0.9%
603	IREDELL	3,327	12	0.4%	0	0.0%	59	1.8%
605	IREDELL	4,493	10	0.2%	1	0.0%	75	1.7%
605	IREDELL	4,012	15	0.4%	1	0.0%	64	1.6%
606	IREDELL	7,359	13	0.2%	0	0.0%	66	0.9%
607	IREDELL	8,653	26	0.3%	2	0.0%	99	1.1%
608	IREDELL	6,577	20	0.3%	0	0.0%	74	1.1%
610	IREDELL	9,418	16	0.2%	4	0.0%	94	1.0%
13	MECKLENBURG	4,319	33	0.8%	1	0.0%	83	1.9%
14	MECKLENBURG	2,656	21	0.8%	0	0.0%	70	2.6%

Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 US Census

Appendix A
2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data

American Indian and Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races (continued)

Census Tract	County	Total Population	American Indian and Alaska Native		Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		Two or More Races	
			#	%	#	%	#	%
15.03	MECKLENBURG	9,191	35	0.4%	2	0.0%	216	2.4%
15.04	MECKLENBURG	4,806	19	0.4%	2	0.0%	70	1.5%
15.05	MECKLENBURG	2,906	13	0.4%	7	0.2%	67	2.3%
15.06	MECKLENBURG	6,423	10	0.2%	3	0.0%	73	1.1%
51	MECKLENBURG	2,628	4	0.2%	0	0.0%	39	1.5%
53.01	MECKLENBURG	2,773	14	0.5%	0	0.0%	48	1.7%
53.03	MECKLENBURG	6,970	22	0.3%	7	0.1%	72	1.0%
53.04	MECKLENBURG	6,393	42	0.7%	2	0.0%	213	3.3%
54.02	MECKLENBURG	6,588	35	0.5%	0	0.0%	109	1.7%
55.04	MECKLENBURG	6,924	29	0.4%	2	0.0%	122	1.8%
55.05	MECKLENBURG	9,327	22	0.2%	2	0.0%	122	1.3%
55.06	MECKLENBURG	11,554	37	0.3%	1	0.0%	133	1.2%
55.07	MECKLENBURG	10,240	26	0.3%	4	0.0%	175	1.7%
56.03	MECKLENBURG	6,373	26	0.4%	6	0.1%	143	2.2%
56.04	MECKLENBURG	5,007	27	0.5%	8	0.2%	105	2.1%
56.05	MECKLENBURG	3,591	9	0.3%	2	0.1%	75	2.1%
56.06	MECKLENBURG	5,720	9	0.2%	2	0.0%	92	1.6%
56.07	MECKLENBURG	6,653	30	0.5%	2	0.0%	116	1.7%
9603	MONTGOMERY	3,340	11	0.3%	0	0.0%	37	1.1%
301	RANDOLPH	4,498	28	0.6%	2	0.0%	124	2.8%
302.01	RANDOLPH	3,221	5	0.2%	0	0.0%	58	1.8%
302.02	RANDOLPH	4,946	10	0.2%	4	0.1%	92	1.9%
303.01	RANDOLPH	5,319	28	0.5%	1	0.0%	94	1.8%
303.02	RANDOLPH	3,264	13	0.4%	0	0.0%	64	2.0%
304	RANDOLPH	3,896	22	0.6%	0	0.0%	54	1.4%
305.01	RANDOLPH	10,584	54	0.5%	1	0.0%	66	0.6%

Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 US Census

Appendix A
2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data

American Indian and Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races (continued)

Census Tract	County	Total Population	American Indian and Alaska Native		Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		Two or More Races	
			#	%	#	%	#	%
305.02	RANDOLPH	3,717	7	0.2%	1	0.0%	8	0.2%
306	RANDOLPH	5,753	31	0.5%	0	0.0%	49	0.9%
307	RANDOLPH	5,614	5	0.1%	1	0.0%	34	0.6%
308.01	RANDOLPH	5,688	19	0.3%	0	0.0%	36	0.6%
308.02	RANDOLPH	6,263	27	0.4%	6	0.1%	51	0.8%
309	RANDOLPH	3,637	13	0.4%	0	0.0%	31	0.9%
310	RANDOLPH	6,801	21	0.3%	1	0.0%	90	1.3%
311	RANDOLPH	5,960	24	0.4%	0	0.0%	55	0.9%
314	RANDOLPH	6,224	21	0.3%	0	0.0%	68	1.1%
509.02	ROWAN	8,130	40	0.5%	0	0.0%	39	0.5%
510.01	ROWAN	6,793	14	0.2%	1	0.0%	57	0.8%
519.01	ROWAN	6,321	13	0.2%	1	0.0%	88	1.4%
9901	STANLY	7,745	14	0.2%	1	0.0%	56	0.7%
511	WAKE	1,388	30	2.2%	17	1.2%	14	1.0%
523.01	WAKE	3,730	18	0.5%	1	0.0%	44	1.2%
523.02	WAKE	4,631	8	0.2%	0	0.0%	83	1.8%
524.01	WAKE	2,689	4	0.1%	0	0.0%	36	1.3%
524.02	WAKE	8,749	42	0.5%	3	0.0%	260	3.0%
524.04	WAKE	3,907	34	0.9%	1	0.0%	80	2.0%
524.05	WAKE	13,179	97	0.7%	12	0.1%	310	2.4%
530.01	WAKE	16,041	30	0.2%	6	0.0%	198	1.2%
530.02	WAKE	9,878	56	0.6%	5	0.1%	155	1.6%
534.02	WAKE	7,435	12	0.2%	1	0.0%	99	1.3%
534.03	WAKE	17,410	68	0.4%	10	0.1%	271	1.6%
534.04	WAKE	14,168	42	0.3%	3	0.0%	227	1.6%
534.05	WAKE	3,818	2	0.1%	3	0.1%	53	1.4%

Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 US Census

Appendix A
2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data

American Indian and Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races (continued)

Census Tract	County	Total Population	American Indian and Alaska Native		Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander		Two or More Races	
			#	%	#	%	#	%
534.06	WAKE	5,135	7	0.1%	5	0.1%	83	1.6%
534.07	WAKE	6,195	11	0.2%	0	0.0%	84	1.4%
535.01	WAKE	7,458	22	0.3%	4	0.1%	239	3.2%
535.05	WAKE	3,824	6	0.2%	0	0.0%	58	1.5%
535.06	WAKE	5,337	9	0.2%	0	0.0%	84	1.6%
535.07	WAKE	3,069	18	0.6%	0	0.0%	33	1.1%
535.08	WAKE	8,327	47	0.6%	1	0.0%	249	3.0%
535.09	WAKE	5,049	3	0.1%	0	0.0%	42	0.8%
535.10	WAKE	8,011	35	0.4%	1	0.0%	186	2.3%
535.13	WAKE	3,475	23	0.7%	6	0.2%	93	2.7%
535.14	WAKE	5,761	11	0.2%	0	0.0%	126	2.2%
535.15	WAKE	5,406	26	0.5%	0	0.0%	75	1.4%
536	WAKE	9,437	39	0.4%	2	0.0%	115	1.2%
US 64-NC 49 Corridor		748,614	2,689	0.4%	230	0.0%	10,031	1.3%
North Carolina		8,049,313	99,551	1.2%	3,983	0.0%	103,260	1.3%

Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 US Census

Appendix A
2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data

Ethnicity Data - Hispanic

Census Tract	County	Total Population	Hispanic	
			#	%
405	CABARRUS	7,134	156	2.2%
406	CABARRUS	5,238	35	0.7%
415	CABARRUS	10,852	149	1.4%
416	CABARRUS	8,028	162	2.0%
417	CABARRUS	6,685	46	0.7%
418	CABARRUS	383	15	3.9%
419	CABARRUS	6,241	1,196	19.2%
420	CABARRUS	4,723	248	5.3%
421	CABARRUS	6,482	1,103	17.0%
422	CABARRUS	5,644	105	1.9%
423	CABARRUS	4,522	432	9.6%
424	CABARRUS	7,487	669	8.9%
425	CABARRUS	8,540	210	2.5%
426	CABARRUS	13,594	405	3.0%
201	CHATHAM	10,457	444	4.2%
202	CHATHAM	6,282	369	5.9%
203	CHATHAM	2,681	207	7.7%
204	CHATHAM	9,159	3,129	34.2%
206	CHATHAM	4,707	109	2.3%
207	CHATHAM	5,612	153	2.7%
208	CHATHAM	6,832	259	3.8%
603	DAVIDSON	13,056	163	1.2%
604	DAVIDSON	4,541	42	0.9%
605	DAVIDSON	5,345	40	0.7%
611	DAVIDSON	6,357	40	0.6%
612	DAVIDSON	9,084	487	5.4%
613	DAVIDSON	2,443	177	7.2%
614	DAVIDSON	3,663	501	13.7%
615	DAVIDSON	6,556	676	10.3%
616	DAVIDSON	2,879	402	14.0%
617	DAVIDSON	14,460	151	1.0%
618.01	DAVIDSON	9,149	155	1.7%
618.02	DAVIDSON	6,188	61	1.0%
619	DAVIDSON	11,185	71	0.6%
620	DAVIDSON	8,301	86	1.0%
801	DAVIE	6,773	295	4.4%
803	DAVIE	6,784	123	1.8%
804	DAVIE	4,073	45	1.1%
805	DAVIE	3,604	274	7.6%

Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 Census

Appendix A
2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data

Ethnicity Data – Hispanic (continued)

Census Tract	County	Total Population	Hispanic	
			#	%
806	DAVIE	3,376	222	6.6%
807	DAVIE	6,063	177	2.9%
601	IREDELL	5,260	394	7.5%
602	IREDELL	2,089	179	8.6%
603	IREDELL	3,327	358	10.8%
604	IREDELL	4,493	463	10.3%
605	IREDELL	4,012	163	4.1%
606	IREDELL	7,359	314	4.3%
607	IREDELL	8,653	322	3.7%
608	IREDELL	6,577	318	4.8%
610	IREDELL	9,418	450	4.8%
13	MECKLENBURG	4,319	321	7.4%
14	MECKLENBURG	2,656	168	6.3%
15.03	MECKLENBURG	9,191	1,756	19.1%
15.04	MECKLENBURG	4,806	297	6.2%
15.05	MECKLENBURG	2,906	332	11.4%
15.06	MECKLENBURG	6,423	247	3.8%
51	MECKLENBURG	2,628	192	7.3%
53.01	MECKLENBURG	2,773	625	22.5%
53.03	MECKLENBURG	6,970	566	8.1%
53.04	MECKLENBURG	6,393	2,831	44.3%
54.02	MECKLENBURG	6,588	211	3.2%
55.04	MECKLENBURG	6,924	437	6.3%
55.05	MECKLENBURG	9,327	266	2.9%
55.06	MECKLENBURG	11,554	258	2.2%
55.07	MECKLENBURG	10,240	338	3.3%
56.03	MECKLENBURG	6,373	510	8.0%
56.04	MECKLENBURG	5,007	129	2.6%
56.05	MECKLENBURG	3,591	202	5.6%
56.06	MECKLENBURG	5,720	203	3.5%
56.07	MECKLENBURG	6,653	204	3.1%
9603	MONTGOMERY	3,340	25	0.7%
301	RANDOLPH	4,498	967	21.5%
302.01	RANDOLPH	3,221	496	15.4%
302.02	RANDOLPH	4,946	774	15.6%
303.01	RANDOLPH	5,319	1394	26.2%
303.02	RANDOLPH	3,264	613	18.8%
304	RANDOLPH	3,896	706	18.1%
305.01	RANDOLPH	10,584	119	1.1%

Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 Census

Appendix A
2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data

Ethnicity Data – Hispanic (continued)

Census Tract	County	Total Population	Hispanic	
			#	%
305.02	RANDOLPH	3,717	152	4.1%
306	RANDOLPH	5,753	214	3.7%
307	RANDOLPH	5,614	136	2.4%
308.01	RANDOLPH	5,688	183	3.2%
308.02	RANDOLPH	6,263	226	3.6%
309	RANDOLPH	3,637	58	1.6%
310	RANDOLPH	6,801	566	8.3%
311	RANDOLPH	5,960	382	6.4%
314	RANDOLPH	6,224	537	8.6%
509.02	ROWAN	8,130	127	1.6%
510.01	ROWAN	6,793	98	1.4%
519.01	ROWAN	6,321	247	3.9%
9901	STANLY	7,745	51	0.7%
511	WAKE	1,388	108	7.8%
523.01	WAKE	3,730	96	2.6%
523.02	WAKE	4,631	206	4.4%
524.01	WAKE	2,689	59	2.2%
524.02	WAKE	8,749	1,310	15.0%
524.04	WAKE	3,907	187	4.8%
524.05	WAKE	13,179	934	7.1%
530.01	WAKE	16,041	250	1.6%
530.02	WAKE	9,878	504	5.1%
534.02	WAKE	7,435	145	2.0%
534.03	WAKE	17,410	597	3.4%
534.04	WAKE	14,168	563	4.0%
534.05	WAKE	3,818	47	1.2%
534.06	WAKE	5,135	129	2.5%
534.07	WAKE	6,195	161	2.6%
535.01	WAKE	7,458	1034	13.9%
535.05	WAKE	3,824	66	1.7%
535.06	WAKE	5,337	117	2.2%
535.07	WAKE	3,069	140	4.6%
535.08	WAKE	8,327	929	11.2%
535.09	WAKE	5,049	75	1.5%
535.10	WAKE	8,011	360	4.5%
535.13	WAKE	3,475	159	4.6%
535.14	WAKE	5,761	163	2.8%
535.15	WAKE	5,406	169	3.1%
536	WAKE	9,437	261	2.8%

Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 Census

Appendix A
2000 US Census Race and Ethnicity Data

Ethnicity Data – Hispanic (continued)

Census Tract	County	Total Population	Hispanic	
			#	%
US 64-NC 49 Corridor		748,614	43,683	5.8%
North Carolina		8,049,313	378,963	4.7%

Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 Census

Appendix B

2000 US Census Income Data

Appendix B
2000 US Census Income Data

Census Tract	County	Total Population*	At or Above Poverty Level		Below Poverty Level	
			#	%	#	%
405	CABARRUS	7,092	6,787	95.7%	305	4.3%
406	CABARRUS	5,224	5,142	98.4%	82	1.6%
415	CABARRUS	10,844	10,546	97.3%	298	2.7%
416	CABARRUS	8,022	7,316	91.2%	706	8.8%
417	CABARRUS	6,461	6,247	96.7%	214	3.3%
418	CABARRUS	254	223	87.8%	31	12.2%
419	CABARRUS	5,894	5,062	85.9%	832	14.1%
420	CABARRUS	4,392	3,946	89.8%	446	10.2%
421	CABARRUS	6,463	5,356	82.9%	1,107	17.1%
422	CABARRUS	5,637	5,582	99.0%	55	1.0%
423	CABARRUS	4,401	3,827	87.0%	574	13.0%
424	CABARRUS	7,184	6,707	93.4%	477	6.6%
425	CABARRUS	8,499	8,021	94.4%	478	5.6%
426	CABARRUS	13,574	13,048	96.1%	526	3.9%
201	CHATHAM	10,440	9,732	93.2%	708	6.8%
202	CHATHAM	6,210	5,721	92.1%	489	7.9%
203	CHATHAM	2,636	2,213	84.0%	423	16.0%
204	CHATHAM	8,983	7,716	85.9%	1,267	14.1%
206	CHATHAM	4,636	4,279	92.3%	357	7.7%
207	CHATHAM	5,490	5,145	93.7%	345	6.3%
208	CHATHAM	6,584	5,974	90.7%	610	9.3%
603	DAVIDSON	12,878	12,350	95.9%	528	4.1%
604	DAVIDSON	4,527	4,192	92.6%	335	7.4%
604	DAVIDSON	5,306	4,977	93.8%	329	6.2%
611	DAVIDSON	6,245	5,830	93.4%	415	6.6%
612	DAVIDSON	9,063	7,862	86.7%	1,201	13.3%
613	DAVIDSON	2,405	2,083	86.6%	322	13.4%
614	DAVIDSON	3,019	1,799	59.6%	1,220	40.4%
615	DAVIDSON	6,498	5,241	80.7%	1,257	19.3%
616	DAVIDSON	2,852	2,294	80.4%	558	19.6%
617	DAVIDSON	14,359	13,285	92.5%	1,074	7.5%
618.01	DAVIDSON	9,098	8,272	90.9%	826	9.1%
618.02	DAVIDSON	6,179	5,900	95.5%	279	4.5%
619	DAVIDSON	11,075	10,109	91.3%	966	8.7%
620	DAVIDSON	8,138	7,270	89.3%	868	10.7%
801	DAVIE	6,755	6,325	93.6%	430	6.4%
803	DAVIE	6,619	6,344	95.8%	275	4.2%

* Persons for Whom Poverty is Determined
Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 US Census

Appendix B
2000 US Census Income Data

Census Tract	County	Total Population*	At or Above Poverty Level		Below Poverty Level	
			#	%	#	%
804	DAVIE	4,052	3,748	92.5%	304	7.5%
805	DAVIE	3,522	3,021	85.8%	501	14.2%
806	DAVIE	3,195	2,921	91.4%	274	8.6%
807	DAVIE	6,046	5,137	85.0%	909	15.0%
601	IREDELL	5,073	4,633	91.3%	440	8.7%
602	IREDELL	2,331	1,691	72.5%	640	27.5%
603	IREDELL	3,063	2,318	75.7%	745	24.3%
604	IREDELL	4,489	3,313	73.8%	1,176	26.2%
605	IREDELL	3,799	3,347	88.1%	452	11.9%
606	IREDELL	7,183	6,607	92.0%	576	8.0%
607	IREDELL	8,636	8,038	93.1%	598	6.9%
608	IREDELL	6,517	5,903	90.6%	614	9.4%
610	IREDELL	9,409	8,879	94.4%	530	5.6%
13	MECKLENBURG	4,180	3,232	77.3%	948	22.7%
14	MECKLENBURG	2,679	2,083	77.8%	596	22.2%
15.03	MECKLENBURG	9,174	8,252	89.9%	922	10.1%
15.04	MECKLENBURG	4,718	4,146	87.9%	572	12.1%
15.05	MECKLENBURG	2,850	2,628	92.2%	222	7.8%
15.06	MECKLENBURG	6,418	5,706	88.9%	712	11.1%
51	MECKLENBURG	2,623	1,807	68.9%	816	31.1%
53.01	MECKLENBURG	2,642	2,216	83.9%	426	16.1%
53.03	MECKLENBURG	6,935	5,689	82.0%	1246	18.0%
53.04	MECKLENBURG	6,374	4,451	69.8%	1923	30.2%
54.02	MECKLENBURG	6,588	5,771	87.6%	817	12.4%
55.04	MECKLENBURG	6,912	5,760	83.3%	1,152	16.7%
55.05	MECKLENBURG	9,327	9,009	96.6%	318	3.4%
55.06	MECKLENBURG	11,554	11,129	96.3%	425	3.7%
55.07	MECKLENBURG	9,928	9,297	93.6%	631	6.4%
56.03	MECKLENBURG	6,306	5,292	83.9%	1,014	16.1%
56.04	MECKLENBURG	1,605	1,125	70.1%	480	29.9%
56.05	MECKLENBURG	3,710	3,089	83.3%	621	16.7%
56.06	MECKLENBURG	5,707	5,574	97.7%	133	2.3%
56.07	MECKLENBURG	6,614	6,481	98.0%	133	2.0%
9603	MONTGOMERY	3,341	3,057	91.5%	284	8.5%
301	RANDOLPH	4,229	3,492	82.6%	737	17.4%
302.01	RANDOLPH	3,209	2,953	92.0%	256	8.0%
302.02	RANDOLPH	4,946	4,695	94.9%	251	5.1%
303.01	RANDOLPH	5,306	4,614	87.0%	692	13.0%

* Persons for Whom Poverty is Determined
Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 US Census

Appendix B
2000 US Census Income Data

Census Tract	County	Total Population*	At or Above Poverty Level		Below Poverty Level	
			#	%	#	%
303.02	RANDOLPH	2,902	2,093	72.1%	809	27.9%
304	RANDOLPH	3,750	3,024	80.6%	726	19.4%
305.01	RANDOLPH	10,540	9,745	92.5%	795	7.5%
305.02	RANDOLPH	3,712	3,465	93.3%	247	6.7%
306	RANDOLPH	5,746	5,516	96.0%	230	4.0%
307	RANDOLPH	5,559	4,910	88.3%	649	11.7%
308.01	RANDOLPH	5,666	5,492	96.9%	174	3.1%
308.02	RANDOLPH	6,251	5,752	92.0%	499	8.0%
309	RANDOLPH	3,630	3,399	93.6%	231	6.4%
310	RANDOLPH	6,749	5,894	87.3%	855	12.7%
311	RANDOLPH	5,931	5,335	90.0%	596	10.0%
314	RANDOLPH	6,196	5,622	90.7%	574	9.3%
509.02	ROWAN	8,120	7,714	95.0%	406	5.0%
510.01	ROWAN	6,639	6,233	93.9%	406	6.1%
519.01	ROWAN	6,300	5,613	89.1%	687	10.9%
9901	STANLY	7,343	6,715	91.4%	628	8.6%
511	WAKE	383	235	61.4%	148	38.6%
523.01	WAKE	3,730	2,752	73.8%	978	26.2%
523.02	WAKE	4,545	3,534	77.8%	1,011	22.2%
524.01	WAKE	1,639	1,397	85.2%	242	14.8%
524.02	WAKE	8,761	7,325	83.6%	1,436	16.4%
524.04	WAKE	3,907	3,019	77.3%	888	22.7%
524.05	WAKE	6,668	4,213	63.2%	2,455	36.8%
530.01	WAKE	16,035	15,810	98.6%	225	1.4%
530.02	WAKE	9,872	9,152	92.7%	720	7.3%
534.02	WAKE	7,429	7,325	98.6%	104	1.4%
534.03	WAKE	17,405	16,750	96.2%	655	3.8%
534.04	WAKE	14,143	13,709	96.9%	434	3.1%
534.05	WAKE	3,759	3,725	99.1%	34	0.9%
534.06	WAKE	5,131	5,093	99.3%	38	0.7%
534.07	WAKE	6,057	6,007	99.2%	50	0.8%
535.01	WAKE	7,455	6,536	87.7%	919	12.3%
535.05	WAKE	3,824	3,748	98.0%	76	2.0%
535.06	WAKE	5,204	5,120	98.4%	84	1.6%
535.07	WAKE	2,960	2,736	92.4%	224	7.6%
535.08	WAKE	8,324	7,777	93.4%	547	6.6%
535.09	WAKE	5,032	4,944	98.3%	88	1.7%
535.10	WAKE	7,940	7,527	94.8%	413	5.2%

* Persons for Whom Poverty is Determined
Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 US Census

Appendix B
2000 US Census Income Data

Census Tract	County	Total Population*	At or Above Poverty Level		Below Poverty Level	
535.13	WAKE	3,463	3,171	91.6%	292	8.4%
535.14	WAKE	5,751	5,565	96.8%	186	3.2%
535.15	WAKE	5,396	5,299	98.2%	97	1.8%
536	WAKE	9,430	9,154	97.1%	276	2.9%
US 64-NC 49 Corridor		728,403	661,927	90.9%	66,431	9.1%
North Carolina		7,805,328	6,846,661	87.7%	958,667	12.3%

* Persons for Whom Poverty is Determined
Source: US Bureau of the Census, 2000 US Census

Appendix C

National Center for Education Statistics Data

Appendix C
National Center for Education Statistics Data

Race and Ethnicity Statistics

Elementary School Name	County	City	Students	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
				#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
A T ALLEN	CABARRUS	CONCORD	430	353	82.1%	54	12.6%	20	4.7%	1	0.2%	2	0.5%
ROCKY RIVER	CABARRUS	CONCORD	986	689	69.9%	183	18.6%	102	10.3%	8	0.8%	4	0.4%
WOLF MEADOW	CABARRUS	CONCORD	795	577	72.6%	163	20.5%	44	5.5%	10	1.3%	1	0.1%
HARRISBURG	CABARRUS	HARRISBURG	929	822	88.5%	77	8.3%	12	1.3%	14	1.5%	4	0.4%
MT PLEASANT	CABARRUS	MT PLEASANT	905	790	87.3%	57	6.3%	44	4.9%	10	1.1%	4	0.4%
PITTSBORO	CHATHAM	PITTSBORO	497	312	62.8%	166	33.4%	16	3.2%	2	0.4%	1	0.2%
SAGE ACADEMY	CHATHAM	SILER CITY	51	27	52.9%	18	35.3%	6	11.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
SILER CITY	CHATHAM	SILER CITY	616	91	14.8%	172	27.9%	351	57.0%	2	0.3%	0	0.0%
SILK HOPE	CHATHAM	SILER CITY	525	408	77.7%	56	10.7%	59	11.2%	1	0.2%	1	0.2%
DENTON	DAVIDSON	DENTON	558	554	99.3%	0	0.0%	2	0.4%	0	0.0%	2	0.4%
DAVIS-TOWNSEND	DAVIDSON	LEXINGTON	550	538	97.8%	4	0.7%	3	0.5%	5	0.9%	0	0.0%
PICKETT PRIMARY	DAVIDSON	LEXINGTON	397	112	28.2%	156	39.3%	82	20.7%	45	11.3%	2	0.5%
SILVER VALLEY	DAVIDSON	LEXINGTON	279	275	98.6%	3	1.1%	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
REEDS	DAVIDSON	LEXINGTON	676	651	96.3%	15	2.2%	5	0.7%	4	0.6%	1	0.1%
WELCOME	DAVIDSON	LEXINGTON	717	673	93.9%	18	2.5%	11	1.5%	14	2.0%	1	0.1%
CORNATZER	DAVIE	MOCKSVILLE	459	316	68.8%	69	15.0%	74	16.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
MOCKSVILLE	DAVIE	MOCKSVILLE	563	455	80.8%	79	14.0%	27	4.8%	2	0.4%	0	0.0%
COOL SPRING	IREDELL	CLEVELAND	422	331	78.4%	59	14.0%	19	4.5%	12	2.8%	1	0.2%
NEWELL	MECKLENBURG	CHARLOTTE	673	205	30.5%	314	46.7%	98	14.6%	52	7.7%	4	0.6%
UNIV. MEADOWS	MECKLENBURG	CHARLOTTE	933	204	21.9%	543	58.2%	141	15.1%	40	4.3%	5	0.5%
PAGE STREET	MONTGOMERY	TROY	360	251	69.7%	89	24.7%	15	4.2%	5	1.4%	0	0.0%
TROY	MONTGOMERY	TROY	414	263	63.5%	106	25.6%	37	8.9%	8	1.9%	0	0.0%
MCCRARY	RANDOLPH	ASHEBORO	375	145	38.7%	110	29.3%	114	30.4%	6	1.6%	0	0.0%
DONNA L LOFLIN	RANDOLPH	ASHEBORO	382	200	52.4%	49	12.8%	115	30.1%	17	4.5%	1	0.3%

Source: US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2003.

Race and Ethnicity Statistics (continued)

Appendix C
National Center for Education Statistics Data

Elementary School Name	County	City	Students	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian		Native American	
				#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
GUY B TEACHEY	RANDOLPH	ASHEBORO	416	274	65.9%	56	13.5%	75	18.0%	6	1.4%	5	1.2%
LINDLEY PARK	RANDOLPH	ASHEBORO	341	164	48.1%	115	33.7%	54	15.8%	8	2.3%	0	0.0%
FARMER	RANDOLPH	ASHEBORO	444	434	97.7%	3	0.7%	4	0.9%	2	0.5%	1	0.2%
TABERNACLE	RANDOLPH	ASHEBORO	513	485	94.5%	14	2.7%	10	1.9%	0	0.0%	4	0.8%
FRANKLINVILLE	RANDOLPH	FRANKLINVILLE	497	441	88.7%	30	6.0%	19	3.8%	5	1.0%	2	0.4%
GRAYS CHAPEL	RANDOLPH	FRANKLINVILLE	475	421	88.6%	19	4.0%	28	5.9%	5	1.1%	2	0.4%
RAMSEUR	RANDOLPH	RAMSEUR	483	275	56.9%	104	21.5%	97	20.1%	6	1.2%	1	0.2%
RICHFIELD	STANLY	RICHFIELD	402	357	88.8%	26	6.5%	1	0.2%	17	4.2%	1	0.2%
BAUCOM	WAKE	APEX	849	627	73.9%	114	13.4%	19	2.2%	83	9.8%	6	0.7%
OLIVE CHAPEL	WAKE	APEX	959	788	82.2%	58	6.0%	67	7.0%	45	4.7%	1	0.1%
SALEM	WAKE	APEX	608	443	72.9%	65	10.7%	58	9.5%	42	6.9%	0	0.0%
BRIARCLIFF	WAKE	CARY	521	313	60.1%	123	23.6%	66	12.7%	16	3.1%	3	0.6%
CARY	WAKE	CARY	740	416	56.2%	225	30.4%	76	10.3%	22	3.0%	1	0.1%
FARMINGTON WDS	WAKE	CARY	658	407	61.9%	151	22.9%	61	9.3%	38	5.8%	1	0.2%

Source: US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2003.

Appendix C
National Center for Education Statistics Data

Free and Reduced Meals Program Statistics

Elementary School Name	County	City	Students	Free		Reduced		Free and Reduced	
				#	%	#	%	#	%
A T ALLEN	CABARRUS	CONCORD	430	79	18.4%	40	9.3%	119	27.7%
ROCKY RIVER	CABARRUS	CONCORD	986	197	20.0%	91	9.2%	288	29.2%
WOLF MEADOW	CABARRUS	CONCORD	795	173	21.8%	63	7.9%	236	29.7%
HARRISBURG	CABARRUS	HARRISBURG	929	43	4.6%	26	2.8%	69	7.4%
MT PLEASANT	CABARRUS	MT PLEASANT	905	144	15.9%	55	6.1%	199	22.0%
PITTSBORO	CHATHAM	PITTSBORO	497	134	27.0%	30	6.0%	164	33.0%
SAGE ACADEMY	CHATHAM	SILER CITY	51	11	21.6%	3	5.9%	14	27.5%
SILER CITY	CHATHAM	SILER CITY	616	416	67.5%	93	15.1%	509	82.6%
SILK HOPE	CHATHAM	SILER CITY	525	105	20.0%	30	5.7%	135	25.7%
DENTON	DAVIDSON	DENTON	558	144	25.8%	56	10.0%	200	35.8%
DAVIS-TOWNSEND	DAVIDSON	LEXINGTON	550	120	21.8%	35	6.4%	155	28.2%
PICKETT PRIMARY	DAVIDSON	LEXINGTON	397	280	70.5%	40	10.1%	320	80.6%
SILVER VALLEY	DAVIDSON	LEXINGTON	279	92	33.0%	28	10.0%	120	43.0%
REEDS	DAVIDSON	LEXINGTON	676	136	20.1%	43	6.4%	179	26.5%
WELCOME	DAVIDSON	LEXINGTON	717	152	21.2%	35	4.9%	187	26.1%
CORNATZER	DAVIE	MOCKSVILLE	459	145	31.6%	34	7.4%	179	39.0%
MOCKSVILLE	DAVIE	MOCKSVILLE	563	147	26.1%	52	9.2%	199	35.3%
COOL SPRING	IREDELL	CLEVELAND	422	64	15.2%	51	12.1%	115	27.3%
NEWELL	MECKLENBURG	CHARLOTTE	673	223	33.1%	67	10.0%	290	43.1%
UNIV. MEADOWS	MECKLENBURG	CHARLOTTE	933	364	39.0%	92	9.9%	456	48.9%
PAGE STREET	MONTGOMERY	TROY	360	152	42.2%	34	9.4%	186	51.7%
TROY	MONTGOMERY	TROY	414	197	47.6%	48	11.6%	245	59.2%
MCCRARY	RANDOLPH	ASHEBORO	375	219	58.4%	30	8.0%	249	66.4%
DONNA L LOFLIN	RANDOLPH	ASHEBORO	382	173	45.3%	38	9.9%	211	55.2%
GUY B TEACHEY	RANDOLPH	ASHEBORO	416	122	29.3%	19	4.6%	141	33.9%

Source: US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2003.

Appendix C
National Center for Education Statistics Data

Free and Reduced Meals Program Statistics (continued)

Elementary School Name	County	City	Students	Free		Reduced		Free and Reduced	
				#	%	#	%	#	%
LINDLEY PARK	RANDOLPH	ASHEBORO	341	147	43.1%	27	7.9%	174	51.0%
FARMER	RANDOLPH	ASHEBORO	444	135	30.4%	45	10.1%	180	40.5%
TABERNACLE	RANDOLPH	ASHEBORO	513	140	27.3%	50	9.7%	190	37.0%
FRANKLINVILLE	RANDOLPH	FRANKLINVILLE	497	154	31.0%	42	8.5%	196	39.4%
GRAYS CHAPEL	RANDOLPH	FRANKLINVILLE	475	118	24.8%	37	7.8%	155	32.6%
RAMSEUR	RANDOLPH	RAMSEUR	483	253	52.4%	33	6.8%	286	59.2%
RICHFIELD	STANLY	RICHFIELD	402	59	14.7%	0	0.0%	59	14.7%
BAUCOM	WAKE	APEX	849	39	4.6%	18	2.1%	57	6.7%
OLIVE CHAPEL	WAKE	APEX	959	43	4.5%	23	2.4%	66	6.9%
SALEM	WAKE	APEX	608	74	12.2%	7	1.2%	81	13.3%
BRIARCLIFF	WAKE	CARY	521	112	21.5%	30	5.8%	142	27.3%
CARY	WAKE	CARY	740	170	23.0%	42	5.7%	212	28.6%
FARMINGTON WDS	WAKE	CARY	658	149	22.6%	27	4.1%	176	26.7%

Source: US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2003.

Appendix D

Business Establishments Accepting USDA Food Stamps

APPENDIX D
Business Establishments Accepting USDA Food Stamps
(Current as of October 14, 2004*)

BUSINESS	STREET ADDRESS	CITY/TOWN	ZIP CODE
CABARRUS COUNTY			
CIRCLE K STORE #8383	873 OLD CHARLOTTE HWY	CONCORD	28025
FOOD LION #0377	860 S UNION STREET	CONCORD	28025
FOOD LION #0790	349 COPPERFIELD DR	CONCORD	28025
BI-LO #026	595 US 601 BYPASS S	CONCORD	28025
FOOD LION #0998	80 BRANCHVIEW DR NE	CONCORD	28025
BI-LO #015	840 US HWY 29N	CONCORD	28025
HARRIS TEETER #202	1245 HWY 29	CONCORD	28025
GATE SERVICE STA #404	287 CABARRUS AVE W	CONCORD	28025
K & M CORNER STOP	440 KERR ST	CONCORD	28025
FOOD LION #1621	3501 HIGHWAY 601	CONCORD	28025
KWICK 1 FOOD MART	223 CABARRUS AVE W	CONCORD	28025
PEACOCK FOOD MART	589 HWY 29 N	CONCORD	28025
CENTER CITY MAXX	50 CABARRUS AVE W	CONCORD	28025
SUPER MERCADO LUPITAS	224-228 CABARRUS AVE W	CONCORD	28025
DOLLAR GENERAL #9221	501 WARREN C COLEMAN BLVD	CONCORD	28025
ONE STOP CONVENIENCE STORE	1862 HWY 601 SOUTH	CONCORD	28025
FOOD LION #0203	734 CABARRUS AVE W	CONCORD	28025
SUPER KMART # 4758	545 HWY 29 N	CONCORD	28027
WAL-MART S/C #1027	150 CONCORD COMMONS PLACE	CONCORD	28027
ALDI #95	961 CONCORD PARKWAY SOUTH	CONCORD	28027
FOOD LION #1552	3673 CONCORD PARKWAY S	CONCORD	28027
HARRIS TEETER #068	358 GEORGE W LILES PKWY NW	CONCORD	28027
BLOOM #0564	4226 HWY 49 S	HARRISBURG	28075
LOWES FOOD STORE #210	4445 HWY 49 SOUTH	HARRISBURG	28075
DOLLAR GENERAL #6096	5352 US HWY 49	MT PLEASANT	28124
FOOD LION #0740	7230 HWY 49N	MT PLEASANT	28124
CHATHAM COUNTY			
FOOD LION #0884	431 CHATHAM COMMONS	PITTSBORO	27312
LOWES FOOD STORE #439	HWY 64 EAST	PITTSBORO	27312
SNACK STOP	133 HILLSBORO ST	PITTSBORO	27312
DOLLAR GENERAL #0880	704 E ST	PITTSBORO	27312
LOWES FOOD STORE #450	219 CHATHAM SQ	SILER CITY	27344
BEST MART SUPER MARKET INC	520 W RALEIGH ST	SILER CITY	27344
WAL-MART S/C #2845	14215 US HWY 64 WEST	SILER CITY	27344
PIGGLY WIGGLY #15	600 W RALEIGH ST	SILER CITY	27344
FOOD LION #1689	1605 E 11TH ST	SILER CITY	27344
DONA ANA #2	316 E THIRD ST	SILER CITY	27344
DOLLAR GENERAL #4587	217 CHATHAM SQ	SILER CITY	27344

*Source: Marilyn P. Carpenter, Officer in Charge Raleigh Field Office, Food and Nutrition Service USDA

APPENDIX D
Business Establishments Accepting USDA Food Stamps
(Current as of October 14, 2004*)

BUSINESS	STREET ADDRESS	CITY/TOWN	ZIP CODE
DAVIDSON COUNTY			
LOWES FOOD STORE #066	17525 S 109	DENTON	27239
LANIERS'S SUPERMARKET	43 SOUTH MAIN ST	DENTON	27239
DOLLAR GENERAL #9307	68 GARNER ST	DENTON	27239
CONRAD & HINKLE FOOD MARKET	6 NORTH MAIN ST	LEXINGTON	27292
WINN DIXIE #2015	86 US HWYS 29-64	LEXINGTON	27292
LARRY'S GROCERY	10491 S NC HWY 109	LEXINGTON	27292
FOOD LION #0122	291 TALBERT BLVD	LEXINGTON	27292
WINN DIXIE #2017	802 E CENTER ST	LEXINGTON	27292
FOOD LION #0515	198 COTTON GROVE RD	LEXINGTON	27292
ALDI #82	101 N TALBERT BLVD	LEXINGTON	27292
BI-LO #166	135 LOWES BLVD	LEXINGTON	27292
WAL-MART STORE #1322	37 PLAZA PKWY	LEXINGTON	27292
BEST FOOD MART	203 RALEIGH RD	LEXINGTON	27292
MIMI'S MINI MART	7169 HWY 8	LEXINGTON	27292
LUCY'S DISCOUNT GROCERY	158 WILEY LANE	LEXINGTON	27292
THE SALVAGE GROCERY	4180 HWY 8	LEXINGTON	27292
COMPARE FOODS	800 S MAIN ST	LEXINGTON	27292
CENTRO MUSICAL ARCO IRIS	102 W. 5TH ST	LEXINGTON	27292
DOLLAR GENERAL #8606	858 WINSTON RD	LEXINGTON	27292
DOLLAR GENERAL #2932	282 TALBERT BLVD	LEXINGTON	27292
DOLLAR GENERAL #3472	802 S MAIN ST	LEXINGTON	27292
FOOD LION #0697	1104 MAIN STREET	LEXINGTON	27292
FOOD LION #0924	848 N WINSTON RD	LEXINGTON	27292
FOOD LION #0554	6455 OLD US HWY 52	LEXINGTON	27295
FOOD LION #1575	140 FOREST HILLS RD	LEXINGTON	27295
PAP'S COUNTRY CORNER	1896 OLD US HWY 52	LEXINGTON	27295
CROSS ROAD CENTER	134 ARNOLD RD	LEXINGTON	27295
FRESH MARKET	1307 WINSTON RD	LEXINGTON	27295
DOLLAR GENERAL #3063	48 W US HWY 64	LEXINGTON	27295
DAVIE COUNTY			
FOOD LION #1359	5285 US HWY 158	ADVANCE	27006
LOWES FOODS #205	HWY 801 N, STE 258	ADVANCE	27006
DOLLAR GENERAL #6360	5387 US HWY 158	ADVANCE	27006
B'S MINI MART	1129 YADKINVILLE RD	MOCKSVILLE	27028
DOTTIE'S MARKET	2238 US HWY 601 S	MOCKSVILLE	27028
BI-LO #540	796 VALLEY ROAD	MOCKSVILLE	27028
WAL-MART STORE #1096	1063 YADKINVILLE RD/HWY 61 N	MOCKSVILLE	27028
FOOD LION #0932	1388 HWY 601 S	MOCKSVILLE	27028
DOLLAR GENERAL #2925	1380 SALISBURY RD	MOCKSVILLE	27028
DOLLAR GENERAL #8110	1119-A YADKINVILLE RD	MOCKSVILLE	27028

APPENDIX D
Business Establishments Accepting USDA Food Stamps
(Current as of October 14, 2004*)

*Source: Marilyn P. Carpenter, Officer in Charge Raleigh Field Office, Food and Nutrition Service USDA

BUSINESS	STREET ADDRESS	CITY/TOWN	ZIP CODE
DAVIE COUNTY (continued)			
DOLLAR GENERAL #6410	7846 NC HWY 801S	MOCKSVILLE	27028
FOOD LION #0538	1101 YADKINVILLE RD #4	MOCKSVILLE	27028
IREDELL COUNTY			
FOOD LION #0552	608 TURNERSBURG HWY	STATESVILLE	28625
HARRIS TEETER #116	1545 EAST BROAD ST	STATESVILLE	28625
FOOD LION #1411	1737 WILKESBORO RD	STATESVILLE	28625
BIG KMART # 3808	1530 E BROAD ST	STATESVILLE	28625
WEST IREDELL GROCERY	2159 OLD MOUNTAIN RD	STATESVILLE	28625
DOLLAR GENERAL #2393	3227 TAYLORSVILLE RD	STATESVILLE	28625
HARMONY GALAXY FOOD CENTER	3235 HARMONY HWY	HARMONY	28634
MECKLENBURG COUNTY			
HARRIS TEETER #211	8514 UNIVERSITY CITY BLVD	CHARLOTTE	28213
WINN DIXIE #2024	10215 UNIVERSITY CITY BLVD	CHARLOTTE	28213
GROCERY LIQUIDATION CENTER	6020 N TRYON ST	CHARLOTTE	28213
FOOD LION #0985	1704 HARRIS HOUSTON RD	CHARLOTTE	28213
NANA FASTFOOD MART	520 W SUGAR CREEK RD	CHARLOTTE	28213
NORTH STAR MART	5926 N TRYON ST	CHARLOTTE	28213
LIBERTY FOOD MART	638 W SUGAR CREEK RD	CHARLOTTE	28213
CHARLOTTE FAST MART	1421 TOM HUNTER RD	CHARLOTTE	28213
M & J FOOD MART	118-A TOM HUNTER RD	CHARLOTTE	28213
COMPARE FOODS	4300 N TRYON ST	CHARLOTTE	28213
WINN DIXIE #2001	5300 SUNSET RD	CHARLOTTE	28213
FOOD LION #1351	9323 N TRYON STREET	CHARLOTTE	28262
FOOD LION #0411	2804 W SUGAR CREEK	CHARLOTTE	28262
WAL-MART STORE #2134	8709 JW CLAY BLVD	CHARLOTTE	28262
HARRIS TEETER #220	2720 MALLARD CREEK CH RD	CHARLOTTE	28262
RANDOLPH COUNTY			
LOWES FOOD STORE #060	372 N FAYETTEVILLE ST	ASHEBORO	27203
FOOD LION #0047	1327 E DIXON DR	ASHEBORO	27203
C-STORE	401 E SALISBURY ST	ASHEBORO	27203
FOOD LION #1513	433 NC 49 SOUTH	ASHEBORO	27203
WAL-MART S/C #1132	1226 E DIXIE DR	ASHEBORO	27203
FOOD LION #0352	1200 N FAYETTEVILLE ST	ASHEBORO	27203
LOWES FOOD STORE #151	737 W DIXIE DR	ASHEBORO	27203
WINN DIXIE #2034	837 E DIXIE DR	ASHEBORO	27203
ALDI #43	1318 E DIXIE DR	ASHEBORO	27203
RAMA CURB MARKET	408 E SALISBURY ST	ASHEBORO	27203

APPENDIX D
Business Establishments Accepting USDA Food Stamps
(Current as of October 14, 2004*)

*Source: Marilyn P. Carpenter, Officer in Charge Raleigh Field Office, Food and Nutrition Service USDA

BUSINESS	STREET ADDRESS	CITY/TOWN	ZIP CODE
RANDOLPH COUNTY (continued)			
PUEBLO MARKET	837 W SALISBURY ST	ASHEBORO	27203
EL CORDERO	1110 E SALISBURY ST	ASHEBORO	27203
DOLLAR GENERAL #1684	1463 N FAYETTEVILLEST	ASHEBORO	27203
DOLLAR GENERAL #3470	435 NC HWY 49 S	ASHEBORO	27203
C & C QUICK STOP INC	940 COLERIDGE ROAD	RAMSEUR	27316
DOLLAR GENERAL #1783	137 KING RD	RAMSEUR	27316
LOWES FOOD STORE #136	135 N BRADY ST	RAMSEUR	27316
LEACH & WAGNER INC	7218 NC HWY 62	TRINITY	27370
TRINDALE FOODS	11143 ARCHDALE RD	TRINITY	27370
ROWAN COUNTY			
COMMUNITY GROC & HARDWARE	11260 STATESVILLE BLVD	CLEVELAND	27013
IGA #601	11745 STATESVILLE BLVD SUITE A	CLEVELAND	27013
DOLLAR GENERAL #6073	610-A W MAIN ST	ROCKWELL	28138
FOOD LION #0381	968 W MAIN ST	ROCKWELL	28138
STANLY COUNTY			
FAST STOP #02	112 S MAIN	NEW LONDON	28127
FOOD LION #0766	410 W CHURCH ST	RICHFIELD	28137
DOLLAR GENERAL #2906	149 NHWY 49	RICHFIELD	28137
WAKE COUNTY			
WINN DIXIE #0809	1210 LAURA VILLAGE DR	APEX	27502
KROGER #00357	940 US 64 HWY	APEX	27502
FOOD LION #1338	620 LAURA DUNCAN RD	APEX	27502
HARRIS TEETER #200	2741 NC HWY 55	CARY	27502
FOOD LION #1496	1777 W WILLIAM ST	APEX	27502
LOWES FOODS #195	1405 W WILLIAMS ST SUITE A	APEX	27502
LOWES FOODS #184	5400 APEX PEAKWAY	APEX	27502
DOLLAR GENERAL #8967	710 LAURA DUNCAN RD	APEX	27502
TARGET STORE T-1932	1201 BEAVER CK COMMONS DR	APEX	27502
SCOTT'S GALAXY FOODS	301 EAST WILLIAMS	APEX	27502
WINN DIXIE #0803	1393 KILDAIRE FARM RD	CARY	27511
LOWES FOODS #194	1741 WALNUT ST	CARY	27511
WELLSPRING GROCERY #50	102-B WAVERLY PLACE	CARY	27511
HARRIS TEETER #257	2080 KILDAIRE FARM RD	CARY	27511
BIG KMART # 7323	960 KILDAIRE FARM RD	CARY	27511
LOWES FOODS #196	3480 KILDAIRE FARM RD	CARY	27511
FOOD LION #0624	2458 CARY PKWY	CARY	27511
WAL-MART STORE #2247	2010 KILDAIRE	CARY	27511

APPENDIX D
Business Establishments Accepting USDA Food Stamps
(Current as of October 14, 2004*)

*Source: Marilyn P. Carpenter, Officer in Charge Raleigh Field Office, Food and Nutrition Service USDA

BUSINESS	STREET ADDRESS	CITY/TOWN	ZIP CODE
WAKE COUNTY (continued)			
MI PAISANO	748 E CHATHAM ST STE D	CARY	27511
DOLLAR GENERAL #8946	6426 TRYON ROAD	CARY	27511
DOLLAR GENERAL #9495	990 KILDARE FARM RD	CARY	27511
FOOD LION #0040	980 KILDARE FARM RD	CARY	27511
HARRIS TEETER #130	1111 WALNUT ST	CARY	27511
FOOD LION #0724	2978 KILDARE FARM RD	CARY	27511
ECONO FOOD MART	3801 WESTERN BLVD	RALEIGH	27606
FOOD LION #0816	2861 JONES FRANKLIN RD	RALEIGH	27606
NUR GROCERY	2233-108 AVENT FERRY RD	RALEIGH	27606
GRAND ASIA MARKET	1253 BUCK JONES RD	RALEIGH	27606
HARRIS TEETER #038	5563 WESTERN BLVD	RALEIGH	27606
BIG KMART # 4450	4500 WESTERN BLVD	RALEIGH	27606
ALMADINA SUPERMARKET	1019 METHOD RD	RALEIGH	27606
AROUND THE WORLD MARKET	6715 HILLSBOROUGH ST #100	RALEIGH	27606

*Source: Marilyn P. Carpenter, Officer in Charge Raleigh Field Office, Food and Nutrition Service USDA