



DOE/EIS-0503




*Draft*  
*New England*  
*Clean Power Link Project*  
*Environmental Impact Statement*  
*Volume II*  
*Appendix A-L*



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY  
WASHINGTON, DC

MAY 2015





#### Cover Photo Credits

1. TDI-NE  
(<http://wamc/files/styles/default/public/201410/new-england-clean-power-link-map-ctsy-tdi-new-england.jpg> alt="">)
2. NECPL exit from Lake Champlain (Benson, Vermont) courtesy of TDI-NE
3. Lake Bomoseen, Fair Haven, Vermont courtesy of TDI-NE
4. TDI-NE 2014a

**DRAFT**

**NEW ENGLAND CLEAN POWER LINK PROJECT  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**DOE/EIS-0503**

**VOLUME II: APPENDICES**

---

---

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY DELIVERY  
AND ENERGY RELIABILITY**



**COOPERATING AGENCIES**

**U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
U.S. COAST GUARD**

**MAY 2015**

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

## Table of Contents

Appendix A	Scoping Summary Report .....	A-1
Appendix B	EIS Distribution List .....	B-1
Appendix C	NECPL Project Transmission System Detailed Maps .....	C-1
Appendix D	Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Analysis.....	D-1
Appendix E	CWA Section 404 and Section 10 Permit Application .....	E-1
Appendix F	Vermont 248 Application Cover Letter .....	F-1
Appendix G	TDI-NE General Mitigation Strategies .....	G-1
Appendix H	ESA Section 7 Documentation .....	H-1
Appendix I	NHPA Section 106 Documentation .....	I-1
Appendix J	Environmental Justice Analysis Background .....	J-1
Appendix K	Air Quality Analysis Background.....	K-1
Appendix L	Contractor Disclosure Statement .....	L-1

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

## **APPENDIX D ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER ANALYSIS**

This Page Intentionally Left Blank



### **New England Clean Power Link Project Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Analysis**

The New England Clean Power Link (NECPL) Project (Project) would transport electricity from Canada on a merchant basis for delivery into Independent System Operator of New England (ISO-New England). Transmission Developers, Inc.-New England (TDI-NE) considered a number of different locations for interconnecting the Project transmission system into the New England grid and for siting the direct current (DC) to alternating current (AC) converter station.

To evaluate potential points of interconnection (POI) (i.e., existing substations) for the Project, TDI-NE conducted initial system screening studies of the following existing 345 kilovolt (kV) substations in Vermont as potential POIs (TDI-NE 2014):

- New Haven 345 kV Substation in Addison County, Vermont
- West Rutland 345 kV Substation in Rutland County, Vermont
- Coolidge 345 kV Substation in Windsor County, Vermont

Potential POI assessment was based on the following criteria:

- Availability of interconnection points (breaker positions) at the substation, or the capability to add interconnection points.
- Capability of existing circuits, connected to the substation that could accommodate the additional capacity of the proposed Project, or the need for system upgrades.
- Proximity of a potential converter station site to the substation and an approximation of expected environmental impacts from a potential converter site.
- Accessibility to the substation property for the high voltage direct current (HVAC) transmission cables from the converter station.

The initial system screening studies indicated that the New Haven 345-kV Substation and West Rutland 345 kV Substation were not practical POI locations because each substation is interconnected to only one existing 345 kV transmission line that could deliver the Project's energy from Canada to load throughout New England. The Coolidge 345 kV substation is interconnected to two existing 345 kV transmission lines. Interconnecting the Project at the New Haven 345 kV substation or the West Rutland 345 kV substation would require an additional 345 kV overhead line from the POI to the Coolidge substation in order to effectively long-distance transmission (TDI-NE 2014).

Constructing new overhead HVAC transmission cables would require a new or expanded right-of-way (ROW) for utility corridors, and in metropolitan and suburban areas, land costs are high and public concern regarding aesthetics and potential environmental and health effects (e.g., electric and magnetic fields [EMF]) from an overhead HVAC transmission line result in few such projects proceeding beyond the planning stage. Capacity at existing overhead HVAC transmission corridors can be increased through upgrading and overbuilding; however, most of the high-voltage corridors in the Project area are already at or near capacity because of either technical constraints or security and contingency considerations regarding the loss of common towers (TDI-NE 2014)

#### ***ALTERNATIVES TO CONVERTER STATION LOCATION***

In identifying feasible POIs in western Vermont, TDI-NE concurrently identified possible sites for constructing the converter station in proximity to the POIs. Sites were identified and evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Sufficient land available for the converter station facility (approximately 4.5 acres).
- Proximity to the HVDC transmission cable route to minimize environmental impacts, neighborhood disruption (i.e., disturbances, interruptions, or changes), and costs associated with the cable connections to the converter station.
- Consistency with, and potential impacts on, land uses in proximity to the converter station site.
- Potential environmental impacts associated with the transmission cable installation and the construction of the converter station.

**TABLE 1: FEASIBLE POINTS OF INTERCONNECTION IN WESTERN VERMONT**

<b>Criteria</b>	
	<b>Aquatic Ecosystems</b>
NWI and VSWI Wetlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acres of wetlands within 100’ of alternative</li> <li>• Acres of wetlands within 50’ of alternative</li> </ul>
Stream Crossings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of stream crossings</li> </ul>
	<b>Non-Aquatic Ecosystems</b>
Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of RTE species within 100’ of alternative</li> <li>• Number of RTE species within 50’ of alternative</li> <li>• Acres of RTE habitat within 100’ of alternative</li> <li>• Acres of RTE habitat within 50’ of alternative</li> </ul>
Uncommon Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of uncommon species within 100’ of alternative</li> <li>• Number of uncommon species within 50’ of alternative</li> <li>• Acres of uncommon species habitat within 100’ of alternative</li> <li>• Acres of uncommon species habitat within 50’ of alternative</li> </ul>
Wildlife Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acres of deer wintering areas within 100’ of alternative</li> <li>• Acres of deer wintering areas within 50’ of alternative</li> </ul>
Anthropogenic Resources/Constraints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of Public water sources within 500’ of alternative</li> <li>• Number of hazardous waste sites within 500’ of alternative</li> </ul>

TDI-NE identified two properties as suitable based on these criteria: 1) a 9.8 acre parcel on Nelson Road owned by the Anderson Trust; and b) a 4.8 acre parcel at 278 Nelson Road, both in the Town of Ludlow. The properties are adjacent to each other and located close to the Vermont Electric Power Company (VELCO) Coolidge substation in the Town of Cavendish. Both properties would allow for interconnection to the Coolidge Substation through Nelson Road (a town unpaved road) and/or the VELCO ROW. TDI-NE purchased both properties because of their proximity to the proposed Coolidge Substation POI, combined acreage, potential visual screening by existing vegetation, distance from residential structures, and the presence of only one small wetland on the site in a location that would not affect the siting of the converter station (TDI-NE 2014).

TDI-NE applied the environmental evaluation criteria in *Table 2* to assess the potential impact of each alternative on various environmental resources.

**TABLE 2. CRITERIA TO EVALUATE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF EACH ALTERNATIVE ON VARIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES**

<b>Criteria</b>	
	<b>Aquatic Ecosystems</b>
NWI and VSWI Wetlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acres of wetlands within 100' of alternative</li> <li>• Acres of wetlands within 50' of alternative</li> </ul>
Stream Crossings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of stream crossings</li> </ul>
	<b>Non-Aquatic Ecosystems</b>
Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of RTE species within 100' of alternative</li> <li>• Number of RTE species within 50' of alternative</li> <li>• Acres of RTE habitat within 100' of alternative</li> <li>• Acres of RTE habitat within 50' of alternative</li> </ul>
Uncommon Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of uncommon species within 100' of alternative</li> <li>• Number of uncommon species within 50' of alternative</li> <li>• Acres of uncommon species habitat within 100' of alternative</li> <li>• Acres of uncommon species habitat within 50' of alternative</li> </ul>
Wildlife Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acres of deer wintering areas within 100' of alternative</li> <li>• Acres of deer wintering areas within 50' of alternative</li> </ul>
Anthropogenic Resources/Constraints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of Public water sources within 500' of alternative</li> <li>• Number of hazardous waste sites within 500' of alternative</li> </ul>

### ***ROUTING ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED***

TDI-NE evaluated four alternative routes:

- Lake Segment Alternative- Lake Champlain to West Haven
- Western Segment Alternative – Railroad ROW
- Eastern Segment Alternative – Railroad/Roadway ROW
- Eastern Segment Alternative – VELCO ROW

#### ***Lake Segment Alternative - Lake Champlain to West Haven***

This alternative overlaps with the Project's proposed initial in-lake routing but would proceed for an additional 3 miles south in Lake Champlain to exit the lake via horizontal directional drilling (HDD) in West Haven, Vermont rather than Benson, Vermont. The alternative route would proceed east through West Haven undergrounded in town road ROWs for 8 miles before transferring to the Route 22A ROW and travelling south to Fair Haven for approximately 3.4 miles (TDI-NE 2014).

#### ***Western Segment Alternative – Railroad ROW***

The Project route is compared to an alternative whereby the cables would leave U.S. Route 4 at the intersection with U.S. Route 4A and, after a short distance, enter the Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans) railroad ROW. For this alternative, the cables would be laid within the railroad ROW for approximately 13 miles before intersecting with the Project route in West Rutland.

***Eastern Segment Alternative - Railroad / Roadway ROW***

This alternative overlaps with the Project route within the U.S. Route 4 ROW in West Rutland to the east in the Town of North Clarendon. The alternative would enter the railroad ROW and travel south, then east, to Vermont Route 103 in Ludlow, at which point it would overlap again with the Project route to reach the proposed converter station location. The total length of this alternative would be approximately 30.8 miles to the proposed converter station location, with approximately 23.3 miles in railroad ROW and 7.5 miles in roadway ROW.

***Eastern Segment Alternative - VELCO ROW***

This alternative would depart from the Project route in West Rutland and follows the VELCO ROW to the south / south east for approximately 24 miles to the proposed converter station location.

**Table 3** provides a summary of the alternatives and environmental criteria.

***CONSERVATION AND DEMAND REDUCTION MEASURES***

Under this alternative, reductions in energy use and demand would offset the need for additional electricity in the New England region, thus rendering the Project unnecessary. Consequently, the Project would not be built.

This alternative is eliminated from detailed analysis because it does not meet the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) purpose and need (**Section 1.2**), or TDI-NE's Project Objectives (**Section 1.3**). ISO-NE identified a need to diversify the region's electricity supply. While energy conservation measures are a component of the ISO-NE strategy, there is still a need for adequate electricity supply. Additionally, as defined in **Section 1.4**, the purpose of the Project is to build and operate an electric transmission line to deliver low-carbon, non-intermittent power (approximately 98 percent hydropower) from Québec to serve the New England region. This alternative would not meet this purpose.

**TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF PRACTICAL ALTERNATIVES BY SEGMENT**

Evaluation Criteria	Lake Champlain Segment (Border to Route 4)		Western Segment (Route 4 to West Rutland)		Eastern Segment (West Rutland to Ludlow)		
	Benson	West Haven	Road	Railroad	Road	Railroad	VELCO
Length in miles	110.8	111.9	13	13	29.6	30.8	24
Navigation channel within Route	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Approximate number of permanent easements	1	1	1	1	1	1	Many
Construction/operational access	Off boat	Off boat	Build roads/ off existing	Off existing	Off existing	Build roads/ off existing	Build roads/ off existing
Acres of Wetlands within 100' (NWI)	3.6	1.5	3.6	93.4	18.3	32.2	11.8
Acres of Wetlands within 100' (VSWI)	8	3.1	4.7	129	23.3	37.4	41.2
Stream Crossings	17	13	19	13	36	44	22
Number of RTE Species within 100'	7	10	3	2	4	4	8
Acres of RTE species habitat within 100'	29.2	27.2	17	25	23.8	37.2	50.8
Acres of significant natural communities within 100'	0	1.8	0	5.1	1.8	23.4	5.5
Number of Uncommon Species within 100'	6	8	1	4	2	3	7
Acres of Uncommon Species within 100'	26.5	16.6	0.1	12.2	4.7	1.4	2.7
Acres of Deer Wintering Areas within 100'	1.5	14.3	3.7	0	26.6	47.1	4.5
Number of Groundwater Source Protection Areas within 500'	2	0	8	10	7	6	4
Number of Surface water protection areas within 500'	0	0	0	0	11	5	0
Number of hazardous waste sites within 500'	2	0	2	5	3	3	2
Acres of public land within 500'	0	19.2	101	37.8	101	181	61.7
Acres of 100 year floodplains within 50'	1.6	3.1	4	43.8	41	25.4	12.5
Miles within stormwater impaired watershed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: TDI-NE 2014



This Page Intentionally Left Blank

## **APPENDIX E CWA SECTION 404 AND SECTION 10 PERMIT APPLICATION**

Incorporated by reference November 7, 2014 from TDI-NE to Mike Adams; December 2014;  
[http://necplink.com/docs/army\\_corps/01\\_NECPL\\_USACE\\_Cover\\_Letter\\_11-07-14l.pdf](http://necplink.com/docs/army_corps/01_NECPL_USACE_Cover_Letter_11-07-14l.pdf)

This Page Intentionally Left Blank



14 Gabriel Drive  
Augusta, ME 04330

207.620.3800 PHONE  
207.621.8226 FAX

[www.trcsolutions.com](http://www.trcsolutions.com)

November 7, 2014

Michael Adams  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
New England District  
Vermont Project Office  
8 Carmichael Street, Suite 205  
Essex Junction, VT 05452

**Subject: New England Clean Power Link Project  
Section 404 / Section 10 Permit Application**

Dear Mr. Adams:

Champlain VT, LLC, d/b/a TDI-New England (Applicant or TDI-NE) is proposing to construct, operate, and maintain the New England Clean Power Link Project (Project) to bring renewable sources of power generation in Canada to Vermont and ISO-NE via underwater and underground high-voltage direct current (HVDC) transmission cables. On behalf of the Applicant, please find enclosed an application for construction permits pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (Application). The Applicant intends to supplement this Application in the near future with additional information regarding the anticipated impacts associated with the Project.

The Project will include construction, operation, and maintenance of an approximately 154-mile 1,000-MW, high-voltage electric power transmission system that will have both aquatic (underwater) and terrestrial (underground) segments in the State of Vermont. The underwater portions of the transmission line will be buried in the bed of Lake Champlain, except in areas where the water depth exceeds 150 feet, in which areas the Applicant proposes to place the cables on the Lake bottom. The terrestrial portions of the transmission line will be buried underground within roadway and rail system rights-of-way (ROWS) or on private property controlled by TDI-NE.

In addition to a completed ENG form 4345, the Application provides information related to the project purpose and description, construction methods, alternatives considered, and delineated wetlands and water resources. TDI-NE intends to supplement this application later this year with a quantification of wetlands impacts, avoidance/minimization/mitigation measures, and water quality modeling. The Applicant will also provide a listing of affected property owners at that time as well.

Michael Adams  
November 7, 2014  
Page 2 of 2

We look forward to speaking with you in the near future about this application. Please feel free to contact me at 207-620-3717 or SFMurphy@TRCsolutions.com if you have any questions about the materials presented.

Regards,



Sean Murphy, CEP  
Project Manager

Enclosure

cc: Beth Alafat, USEPA  
Maria Tur, USFWS  
Billy Coster, VT ANR  
Brian Mills, DOE  
Don Jessome, TDI-NE  
Josh Bagnato, TDI-NE



## **APPENDIX F VERMONT 248 APPLICATION COVER LETTER**

December 8, 2014 – incorporate by reference to  
[http://necplink.com/docs/Champlain\\_VT\\_electronic/01%20Cover%20Materials/TDI-NE%20Letter%20to%20Public%20Service%20Board.pdf](http://necplink.com/docs/Champlain_VT_electronic/01%20Cover%20Materials/TDI-NE%20Letter%20to%20Public%20Service%20Board.pdf)

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

December 8, 2014

***By Hand Delivery***

Mrs. Susan Hudson, Clerk  
Vermont Public Service Board  
112 State Street, Drawer 20  
Montpelier, VT 05620-2701

Re: Petition of Champlain VT, LLC d/b/a TDI New England for a Certificate of Public Good, pursuant to 30 V.S.A. §248, authorizing the installation and operation of a high voltage direct current (HVDC) underwater and underground electric transmission line with a capacity of 1,000 MW, a converter station, and other associated facilities, to be located in Lake Champlain and in the Counties of Grand Isle, Chittenden, Addison, Rutland, and Windsor, Vermont, and to be known as the New England Clean Power Link Project (“NECPL”)

Dear Mrs. Hudson:

On behalf of Champlain VT, LLC, d/b/a TDI-New England (“TDI-NE”), we are pleased to enclose for filing in the above-captioned matter the original and six copies of a Section 248 Petition and supporting materials requesting issuance of a Certificate of Public Good.

TDI-NE is requesting Board approval for the installation and operation of a high voltage direct current (HVDC) electric transmission line with a capacity of 1,000 MW that will provide electricity generated by low carbon, renewable energy sources in Canada to the New England electric grid. The line, to be known as the New England Clean Power Link (“NECPL”), will run from the Canadian border at Alburgh, Vermont to Ludlow, Vermont along underwater and underground routes. In Ludlow, the HVDC line will terminate at a converter station that will convert the electrical power to alternating current (AC), and then run to VELCO’s existing 345 kV Coolidge Substation in Cavendish, Vermont, located approximately 0.3 miles to the south along a town road.

The NECPL is an important project for the State of Vermont, and will provide significant environmental, electrical, and economic benefits. As the Petition and supporting materials explain in detail, these benefits include lower electricity costs, diversifying the fuel supply in the region, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, the creation of in-state jobs and millions of dollars in new state and local taxes, and increasing the region's gross domestic product during construction and operation. At the same time, the NECPL will respect Vermont's natural beauty by installing the line underground in existing public rights-of-way, and underwater. In addition, the NECPL will aid Vermont and the New England region in meeting future load growth, and achieving renewable energy and climate change objectives. Finally, the NECPL will support Lake Champlain clean-up efforts, in-state renewable energy programs, and Vermont electric ratepayer relief through the creation of several public good benefit funds.

**Service on Entities Listed in 30 V.S.A. § 248(a)(4)(C)**

Please be advised of the following with respect to service on certain statutory interested parties entitled to receive a copy of the Petition under § 248(a)(4)(C). In order to avoid waste and reduce cost, and given the voluminous size of the Petition, TDI-NE is serving a paper copy of the Petition and an *electronic-only* copy of all supporting materials, including prefiled testimony and exhibits, on the following entities or persons who, in the experience of the undersigned, rarely participate in § 248 cases involving energy projects: the Office of the Attorney General, the Vermont Department of Health, and the Vermont Scenery Preservation Council. If any of these entities wish to receive a complete paper copy of any of the materials filed herewith, upon request to the undersigned, a copy will be sent. All other persons or entities identified in § 248(a)(4)(C) are receiving a paper copy and electronic copy of the Petition and supporting materials.

**Notice to Adjoining Landowners**

Pursuant to PSB Rule 5.402(B), TDI-NE is providing a paper copy of this letter, a project overview map, and the Petition (without supporting materials) to adjoining landowners.

TDI-NE is pleased to file this Petition and looks forward to commencement of the Board's review of the Project as soon as feasible, in order to be in a position to a Board decision by the end of 2015 to meet TDI-NE's target of commencing operations in April 2019.

Thank you in advance for your consideration, and please do not hesitate to contact us if you need any further information.

Sincerely,



Andrew N. Raubvogel, Esq.

Geoffrey H. Hand, Esq.

Brian S. Dunkiel, Esq.

Victoria M. Westgate, Esq.

cc: Service List

Enclosures

1. Certificate of Service
2. Notice of Appearance
3. Petition for a Section 248 Certificate of Public Good
4. Notice to Adjoining Landowners
5. Statement of Compliance re Notice to Adjoining Landowners
6. Index of Section 248 Criteria and Corresponding Evidence
7. List of Prefiled Testimony and Exhibits
8. Prefiled Direct Testimony and Exhibits of the following witnesses:
  - a. Jessome-Martin-Bagnato
  - b. Wironen
  - c. Eng
  - d. Singer
  - e. Parker
  - f. Kavet
  - g. Nelson
  - h. Guerrero-Murphy
  - i. Kaliski
  - j. Buscher
  - k. Heitert
  - l. Olausen
  - m. Murphy
  - n. Bailey
  - o. Thuman
  - p. Sabick



This Page Intentionally Left Blank

# **APPENDIX G TDI-NE GENERAL MITIGATION STRATEGIES**

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

**NECPL MITIGATION SUMMARY TABLE**  
**Steps Taken to Avoid, Minimize and/or Mitigate Potential Impacts**

<b>General Mitigation Strategies</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishing as a fundamental design criterion that the transmission line would be installed underwater and underground -- even though the cost will be significantly higher -- to avoid/reduce visual impacts, fragmentation, and other environmental impacts associated with overhead lines.</li> <li>• Using environmentally sensitive lake installation measures to install approximately 2/3 of the transmission line route in Lake Champlain, which will reduce overall construction time and lessen overland construction impacts on Vermonters.</li> <li>• Locating the overland cable route almost exclusively within existing public rights-of-way (ROW) (other than TDI-NE's property). The ROWs are heavily used, easily accessible during construction, are generally cleared of trees, undergo regular vegetation management and contain existing utilities.</li> <li>• Selecting the proposed Converter Station site from several possible locations by a multidisciplinary team, to significantly reduce potential visual and noise impacts. In addition, the station is sited in close proximity to compatible land uses, including multiple overhead lines and a VELCO substation.</li> <li>• Establishing a conservative overall noise objective at any residence near the Converter Station, and taking measures during siting and design of the Project to ensure that objective is met.</li> </ul>
<b>Specific Environmental Mitigation Strategies for Project Installation</b>
<p><b><u>Lake:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shorelines - Using horizontal directional drilling (HDD) for land/water transitions in Alburgh and Benson entirely avoid impacts to the Lake Champlain shoreline, nearshore environments, and shallow water habitats.</li> <li>• Commitment to restore an existing degraded shoreline on TDI-NE controlled parcel in Benson.</li> <li>• Utilizing installation techniques in the Lake to minimize resuspension of sediments and to avoid specific aquatic archaeological sites.</li> <li>• Timing the installation to avoid sensitive periods of fish life cycles.</li> <li>• Fisheries – In consultation with state regulators, certain known fisheries habitats have been avoided.</li> <li>• Invasive plants - Developing an Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan to prevent the introduction and spread of invasive species.</li> <li>• Turbidity - Real-time monitoring of turbidity during construction, and utilizing controls such as changing the rate of installation in order to reduce suspension of sediments if appropriate.</li> </ul>

- Utilizing environmental inspectors on the installation vessels to monitor compliance with Lake-related regulatory requirements.
- Siting the cable route in conjunction with the Lake Champlain Maritime Museum (“LCMM”) to avoid archaeological resources wherever possible, and committing to LCMM best management practices.

**Overland**

- Streams - Minimizing buried crossings of streams, and avoiding any permanent stream channel or riparian habitat impacts. Utilizing HDD in over 20 locations, spanning almost 5 miles, to avoid any impacts to significant waterbodies such as Otter Creek, Cold River, Castleton River, and Lake Bomoseen.
- Tree clearing - Reducing and minimizing tree clearing within the ROW during project design.
- Routing the project away from or under RTE species and potential significant natural communities to the extent practical to avoid undue adverse impacts. Any tree removal in potentially significant communities will be limited to areas immediately adjacent to the ROW and promptly restored and re-vegetated to preconstruction conditions to the extent practical.
- Identifying potential Indiana Bat roosting trees and designing the route to avoid them.
- A long-term Vegetative Management Plan will be implemented to address the introduction of invasive species and mitigate impacts to RTE plants.
- Due to the project design and the nature of trench construction permanent fill to wetlands will be avoided.
- TDI-NE has, and will, continue to coordinate with VTtrans and VTANR to ensure that crossing culverted streams will not interfere with potential future culvert replacement or stream enhancements. In addition, certain Town and/or State culverts could be replaced and hydrology would be improved during project construction.
- Riparian buffers have been identified in accordance with ANR Buffer Guidelines, and ground contours will be restored following construction to avoid any permanent alterations to waterways, flood elevations, or the ability of land to hold water.
- In certain areas the cable is proposed in roadside stormwater ditches. These ditches will likely be improved as part of construction.

**Public Health and Safety Mitigation Measures**

- The project will use solid-state High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) cables that eliminate the potential for leaks, and which contain protective layers designed to provide superior mechanical and corrosion protection thereby reducing the need for repairs over the lifetime of the project. HVDC cable technology has a proven track record of safety and reliability.
- DC technology, by its nature, significantly reduces electric and magnetic fields in comparison to AC.




By burying the DC line the magnetic impacts are reduced further.

- The line will generally be installed in roadway cleared or safety zones to provide a buffer from traffic. Traffic controls will be implemented per Town, State, and Federal standards.
- Limitations will be placed on construction hours and seasonal restrictions on work along certain ROWs will be imposed.
- The HVDC technology immediately terminates the flow of electricity in the event the cable is compromised. Warning tape and protective material will be placed over the cables in the trench to reduce the chance for the cable to be compromised.
- If blasting is required, pre and post blast surveys will be offered to residents in the vicinity of the blast area.
- Fiber communication may be made available to VTtrans for their broadband program.
- The project route within the lake will avoid public water supplies, and owner/operators of public water supplies will be notified at least three weeks prior to cable installation.
- Owners and operators of infrastructure that will be crossed by the project, including existing electric, gas, telecommunications, water and waste water facilities, will be consulted prior to installation. This infrastructure will be protected by the use of mats.
- Risk of snagging from anchors is minimized due to the burial and concrete protection of the line.
- Communications and response plans will be developed and adopted, including an Aquatic Safety and Communications Plan for coordination with US Coast Guard and maritime users and an Emergency Repair and Response Plan to facilitate an efficient response in the event of an unanticipated breakage of the line.
- The overland and in water cables will be regularly inspected to confirm system integrity.
- Commercial operators in the lake have been briefed on the Project and installation will be coordinated with them, so as to not adversely impact their businesses.
- The Converter Station will be fenced and locked to control access.
- Installation, operation, and maintenance of the project will not require significant use of municipal water or wastewater facilities.
- The project route within the lake will avoid private water supplies.
- The Town of Ludlow who is expected to host the Converter Station, has indicated that the project will not impact their municipal services.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

## **APPENDIX H ESA SECTION 7 DOCUMENTATION**

This Page Intentionally Left Blank



**Department of Energy**  
**Washington, DC 20585**

**January 12, 2015**

Tom Chapman  
**US Fish and Wildlife Service**  
**New England Field Office**  
**70 Commercial Street, Suite 300**  
**Concord, NH 03301-5087**

Dear Mr. Chapman,

This letter is to initiate informal consultation under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) for the proposed New England Clean Power Link Transmission Line Project (NECPL Project).

TDI New England (TDI-NE) applied to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) for a Presidential permit to construct, operate, maintain, and connect an electric transmission line across the United States border with Canada. TDI-NE filed its Presidential permit application on May 20, 2014.

In response to the Presidential permit application, on August 26, 2014, the DOE published the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and to Conduct Public Scoping Meetings, and Notice of Floodplains and Wetlands Involvement (the NOI) in the Federal Register. In the NOI DOE announced its intention to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) to assess the potential environmental impacts of issuing a Presidential permit, the federal action, to TDI-NE to construct, operate, maintain, and connect a new electric transmission line across the U.S.-Canada border in northern Vermont (VT).

A detailed description of the proposed transmission line is located on the EIS website at <http://necplinkeis.com>

The following is a list of threatened and endangered species under the USFWS jurisdiction, which are potentially located in the project area:

- Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*)
- Bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) – delisted but remains under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668C)
- Northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) – Candidate for listing

We ask that you review and approve the above list of potentially affected species, or provide a list of additional species that might be affected and any concerns relative to impacts of the Proposed Action on federally listed species.

Please feel free to contact me directly at any time at [Brian.Mills@hq.DOE.gov](mailto:Brian.Mills@hq.DOE.gov), by phone at (202) 586-8267, or by fax at (202) 586-8008. We look forward to working with your office on this project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Brian Mills".

Brian Mills  
NEPA Document Manager  
Office of National Electricity Delivery, OE-20  
Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy  
Reliability

# **APPENDIX I NHPA SECTION 106 DOCUMENTATION**



This Page Intentionally Left Blank



Department of Energy  
Washington, DC 20585

February 6, 2015

Ms. Laura Trieschmann  
State Historic Preservation Officer  
Vermont Division of Historic Preservation  
1 National Life Drive  
Davis Building, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Montpelier, VT 05620-0501

**SUBJECT:** Initiation Request for Section 106 Consultation under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) for the proposed *New England Clean Power Link* (DOE/EIS-0503)

Dear Ms. Trieschmann:

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE or the Department) is in the process of preparing its draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed New England Clean Power Link (NECPL) project in the state of Vermont. DOE is preparing its draft EIS pursuant to its obligations under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to evaluate environmental impacts of providing a Presidential permit to TDI-New England (TDI-NE) for the construction, operation, maintenance, and connection of the portion of the transmission line within the United States. The proposed DOE federal action is the potential grant of a Presidential permit for the international border crossing requested by TDI-NE as part of its proposal. This action has been determined by DOE to be an undertaking that has potential to cause adverse effects on historic properties per the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's (ACHP's) NHPA implementing regulations at 36 CFR §800.3(a).

The Department is coordinating its compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA with its review under NEPA according to the process set out in 36 CFR §800.3(b). Per standing policy, DOE will explicitly solicit information from the public (via the NEPA process) regarding cultural and historic resources through its Notice of Availability of its draft EIS when published in the *Federal Register*. DOE will also make cultural resources reports and information publicly available, as appropriate, on the NECPL project EIS website at <http://necplinkeis.com>.

In this letter DOE provides you with a summary of the actions that the Department is taking to comply with Section 106 of the NHPA, including project background, efforts to identify historic properties potentially affected by the proposed NECPL project to date, a preliminary list of potentially affected historic properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Properties (NRHP), and a list of potential Section 106 consulting parties for the proposed NECPL project. This letter also discusses DOE's initial proposal for direct Areas of Potential Effect to be used in the Department's proposed phased approach to identification and evaluation of historic resources under Section 106. Furthermore, DOE is

sending this letter as its official request for initiation of Section 106 consultation under NHPA with the Vermont State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) located within the Vermont Division of Historic Preservation, and would appreciate your written reply within 30-days from the date of this letter or as soon as possible.

### Background

On May 20, 2014, Champlain VT, LLC, d/b/a Transmission Developers Inc., New England (TDI-NE) applied to DOE for a Presidential permit <sup>1</sup> for a new approximately 154.1 mile-long, high voltage direct current (HVDC) electric transmission line that would cross the international border between the United States and the Canadian Province of Quebec, near the village of Alburgh, Vermont, and terminate at the existing Coolidge Substation in the towns of Ludlow and Cavendish, Vermont. The project would have an operating voltage of +/- 300 to 320 kilovolts (kV) with an expected power transfer rating of 1000 megawatts (MW). The transmission line would be a bipole line that consists of two solid (no fluids) dielectric, cross-linked polyethylene transmission cables, one positively charges and the other negatively charges.

The proposed NECPL project would be constructed in both aquatic (underwater) and terrestrial (underground) environments. From the Canadian border, the proposed transmission line would be located underground in Alburgh, Vermont, for approximately 0.5 miles and would enter Lake Champlain via a horizontal directional drill (HDD). The cables would then be buried in the bed of Lake Champlain to a target depth of 3-4 feet except at depths of greater than 150 feet where cables would be laid on the lake bottom. Installation of the cables in Lake Champlain would occur within the jurisdictional waters of Vermont for 97.6 miles. The cables would emerge from Lake Champlain in the town of Benson, Vermont and would be buried along town roads and state highway rights-of-way for approximately 55.7 miles until terminating at a proposed converter station in Ludlow, Vermont. The total direct current portion of the project is approximately 153.8 miles. From the converter station, the proposed NECPL project would involve underground installation of a single circuit 345-kV high voltage alternating current (HVAC) transmission system (i.e., two underground HVAC lines) which would run approximately 0.3 miles to the existing Coolidge Substation in Cavendish, Vermont owned by the Vermont Electric Power Company (VELCO) (*see enclosed NECPL Project Overview map*).

DOE is the lead federal agency in the preparation of the subject EIS. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England District (USACE), U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1, will be cooperating agencies to DOE in the preparation of this EIS. DOE is also the lead federal agency for purposes of compliance with Section 106, in accordance with 36 CFR § 800.2(a)(2), and will address the potential effects of the NEPA cooperating agencies' proposed actions on historic and archaeological resources.

DOE documented a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS in the *Federal Register* on August 26, 2014 (79 FR 50901), with an open public scoping period which ended on October 10, 2014 (*see enclosed NECPL NOI*). The NOI specifically indicated that cultural and

---

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with Executive Order (EO) 10485, as amended by EO 12038, and the regulations at 10 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 205.320 et seq. (2000), "Application for Presidential Permit Authorizing the Construction, Connection, Operation, and Maintenance of Facilities for Transmission of Electric Energy at International Boundaries."

historic resources are being analyzed as part of the federal environmental review. While the proposed federal action (and undertaking) is the potential grant of a Presidential permit by DOE for the international border crossing, the proposed construction, operation, maintenance, and connection of the portion of the transmission line within the United States is a connected action to DOE's proposed action under NEPA. DOE is therefore analyzing the potential environmental impacts from the proposed federal action and the connected action in the EIS. For the purposes of compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA, DOE is considering the potential for adverse effects to cultural and historic properties for the proposed border crossing and entire length of the proposed transmission line.

### Consulting Parties

In accordance with 36 CFR §800.2, DOE has identified potential consulting parties, including ACHP, SHPO, THPOs, the Applicant, local government representatives, other Native American entities, local historical societies, heritage preservation commissions, state agencies, sites and museums, state-wide groups, national groups, and private individuals with a for the purposes of Section 106 consultation under NHPA. A list of consulting parties identified by DOE is enclosed with this letter for your review and input (*see enclosed Draft List of NECPL Section 106 Consulting Parties*). DOE requests that you and your staff provide the Department with feedback regarding any other potential Section 106 consulting parties for the NECPL project that may not have yet been identified or that should be included in this list of potential consulting parties. Any assistance your office may provide in this matter at this time is greatly appreciated.

As proposed, the NECPL project does not directly involve tribal reservation lands or require a right-of-way grant or special use grant from tribes, however, the proposal is located in an area that was inhabited by numerous American Indians before Euro-American settlement. As a result the proposal has the potential to impact tribes with current or historic interest in the project area.

In accordance with its responsibilities under Section 106, NEPA, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (16 U.S.C. 1996), the Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470aa-mm), the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (25 U.S.C. 3001, et. seq.), Executive Order 13175 *Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments*, (November 6, 2000), and DOE's "American Indian and Alaska Native Tribal Government Policy," as set forth in DOE Order 1230.2 (October 2000), DOE is initiating government-to-government consultation with the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) for the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Band of Mohican Indians. DOE understands that this Federally-recognized Tribe has an historic interest in resources of traditional or cultural importance in wetlands areas potentially affected by the proposed NECPL project, and will initiate its government-to-government consultation effort directly with this THPO and Tribe.

### Identification Efforts to Date

The proposed undertaking has the potential to affect historic properties either listed in, or eligible for, inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. An initial cultural resources survey (i.e., desktop literature review) was performed by TDI-NE as part of the NECPL project Presidential permit application to DOE. This survey considered a geographic area within which the Project may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, and includes all areas along the proposed transmission line construction corridor where ground-disturbing activities would be conducted. It also included those areas outside the

proposed transmission corridor, including the Ludlow HVDC Converter Station site, laydown areas, access roads, and other locations that may be affected by the Project construction and operations.

An initial study of the NHRP listed or eligible properties by TDI-NE found the following list within proximity to the proposed NECPL project, as provided in Appendix D to TDI-NE's Presidential permit application:

Site Name	Distance from Proposed Project Route
Benson Village	0.25 miles
Cold River Bridge	0.25 miles
East Clarendon Railroad Station	50'
Laurel Glen Mausoleum--Laurel Hall	0.25 miles
Mountain View Stock Farm	50'
Smith, Simeon, House	0.25 miles

The NECPL Presidential permit application, including associated maps, drawings, and initial cultural resources study, can also be viewed or downloaded in its entirety from the DOE Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability (OE) program Web site at: <http://energy.gov/oe/downloads/application-presidential-permit-oe-docket-no-pp-400-tdi-new-england-new-england-clean>.

As a part of this effort, TDI-NE met with representatives from Vermont Historic Preservation Office to provide NECPL project briefings on December 9, 2013, and January 14, 2014. TDI-NE also met with your staff to discuss archaeological, cultural and historic resources specific to the Lake Champlain segment of the proposed NECPL project on February 13, 2014, which also included Lake Champlain Maritime Museum (LCMM) staff. Staff from your office also responded to requests by TDI-NE for periodic discussions about proposed Phase 1A assessment work plans for the proposed NECPL project during April 2014 – November 2014.

In addition to efforts by TDI-NE to identify historic resources potentially affected by the proposed NECPL project, DOE held two NEPA public scoping meetings in Burlington, Vermont, on September 16, 2014 and in Rutland, Vermont, on September 17, 2014, during a 45-day public scoping comment period. The meetings held in the towns of Burlington and Rutland, Vermont. DOE received two comments related to the overall consideration of potential effects to historic and archaeological resources and traditional cultural properties. No specific historic, archaeological or cultural resources were identified during the scoping period for the proposed NECPL project. DOE's *New England Clean Power Link Project Scoping Summary Report* (November 2014) is attached to this letter for your information and review.

#### Cultural Resource Studies

At this time, DOE understands that Vermont Office of Historic Preservation has been provided with the following cultural resource reports completed by TDI-NE for the proposed NECPL project:

- *Phase IA Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey, New England Clean Power Line Project – Overland Portion: Windsor, Rutland, and Grand Isle Counties in Vermont* (November 2014);
- *Historical Reconnaissance Survey, New England Clean Power Line Project – Overland Portion: Windsor, Rutland, and Grand Isle Counties in Vermont* (November 2014); and
- *Phase IA Archaeological Assessment in Support of the New England Clean Power Link Project- Lake Portion: Grans Isle County, Chittenden County, Addison County and Rutland County, Vermont* (November 2014).

DOE is also aware that NE-TDI filed for a Vermont Certificate of Public Good with the Vermont Public Service Board (PSB) on 12/8/2014, with information relevant to historic and archaeological sites in the “Environmental Considerations” section of that filing (per 30 VSA §248(b)(5)). At this time, DOE is not including hardcopies of the above mentioned three reports or historic and archaeological evidentiary information from the Vermont PSB filing with this Section 106 initiation request unless otherwise requested by your office. Please let DOE know as soon as possible if your office needs copies of these resources.

#### Scope of Future Identification Efforts under Section 106

In order to begin your consideration of DOE’s scope of future identification and evaluation efforts, the Department typically defines an Area of Potential Effect (APE) for this type of undertaking that includes the geographic area or areas within which the Project may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist. The APE includes all areas along the transmission cable corridor where ground-disturbing activities will be conducted. The APE would also include areas outside the transmission cable corridor, including the converter station site, the HVAC cable alignment, transmission interconnection sites, laydown areas, access roads, and other locations that may be affected by Project construction and operations. Additionally, the APE would take into account standing historic properties (i.e., buildings, structures, individual objects, and districts) that may be indirectly affected by the use of heavy equipment, particularly along the overland sections of the Project’s proposed route.

The width of the construction corridor varies based on installation techniques and environment. The excavation of the cable trench, installation of erosion and sediment control measures, installation of the cables, and stockpiling of excavated materials are expected to occur within a 50-foot-wide corridor, or 25 feet on either side of the Project’s centerline. To accommodate additional areas beyond the footprint of the trench that may be necessary for laydown/staging areas, and to accommodate indirect effects of Project construction activities, the APE for this undertaking has been defined to include an area encompassing 25 feet on either side of the Project’s centerline. DOE looks forward to future discussions with you and other consulting parties about the APE for the NECPL project, and understands that no final APE determinations may be made at this time.

Finally, the Department wants to take this opportunity to inform you early on of its intent to develop a PA pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.14(b) to resolve the proposed Project’s potential effects on historic properties at this time. The PA would be developed in consultation with SHPO, THPO, Consulting Parties, the public, and other interested parties, as appropriate. The PA would

require TDI-NE to develop a Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP) for the proposed NECPL project in consultation with your office and the Consulting Parties prior to initiation of construction activities.

In close, DOE currently seeks your concurrence on initiating its Section 106 consultation process for the proposed New England Clean Power Link project. DOE also seeks any information or suggestions that your office may have with regard to potential consulting parties or tribes that are included in the attached consulting parties list, or if you have additional information that should be considered at this time. Please provide your Section 106 initiation concurrence and any material information that you may have in writing so that it may be added to the administrative record to evidence DOE's compliance with Section 106 consultation responsibilities.

At this time, we also wish to clarify the name and contact information for the Department's representative for purposes of consultation pursuant to Section 106. In accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.2(a)(3), the DOE has authorized Kleinschmidt Group to prepare DOE's subject EIS, which will include an analysis of the proposed NECPL Project's potential for adverse effects on cultural resources, including historic properties as defined by Section 106 of the NHPA and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800. Coordination of consultation activities under the Section 106 process will be completed by Ms. Kelly Schaeffer, Senior Regulatory Advisor at Kleinschmidt Group. Ms. Schaeffer can be contacted at (703) 753-9772 or by e-mail at [Kelly.Schaeffer@KleinschmidtGroup.com](mailto:Kelly.Schaeffer@KleinschmidtGroup.com). DOE remains legally responsible for findings and determinations and for the DOE's government-to-government relationships with Indian tribes.

DOE very much looks forward to working with you and your staff in the near future and appreciates your assistance in this effort. If you have any questions or comments regarding the proposed NECPL project, please contact me directly at any time at [Brian.Mills@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Brian.Mills@hq.doe.gov) or (202) 586-8267.

Yours very truly,




Brian Mills  
National Electricity Delivery Division (OE-20)  
Office of Electricity Delivery and  
Energy Reliability  
U.S. Department of Energy

Enclosed:

- NECPL Project Overview Map
- DOE's NECPL Notice of Intent (NOI) (August 2014)
- Draft List NECPL Section 106 Consulting Parties
- NECPL Scoping Summary report (November 2014)

Cc: Charlene Dwin Vaughn, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation



**Department of Energy  
Washington, DC 20585**

April 16, 2015

Ms. Laura Trieschmann  
State Historic Preservation Officer  
Vermont Division of Historic Preservation  
1 National Life Drive  
Davis Building, 6th Floor  
Montpelier, VT 05620-0501

Subject: APE Determination

Dear Ms. Trieschmann:

As you are aware, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is considering whether or not to grant a Presidential permit to Champlain VT, LLC, d/b/a Transmission Developers, Inc.-New England (TDI-NE) for its proposed transmission facility, the New England Clean Power Link (NECPL) Transmission Line Project crossing at the U.S.-Canada border in northern Vermont.

Our letter of February 6, 2015 for Initiation of Section 106 Consultation under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) at 36 CFR Part 800 for the proposed NECPL project is attached.

This letter presents the DOE's proposed Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the proposed NECPL project.

The proposed direct APE includes the geographic area or areas within which the Project may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist. The APE includes all areas along the transmission cable corridor where ground-disturbing activities will be conducted. The APE will also include areas outside the transmission cable corridor, including the converter station site, the HVAC cable alignment, transmission interconnection sites, laydown areas, access roads, and other locations that may be affected by Project construction and operations. Additionally, the APE will take into account standing historic properties (i.e., buildings, structures, individual objects, and districts) that may be indirectly affected by the use of heavy equipment, particularly along the overland sections of the Project's proposed route.

The width of the construction corridor varies based on installation techniques and environment. The excavation of the cable trench, installation of erosion and sediment control measures, installation of the cables, and stockpiling of excavated materials are expected to occur within a



25-foot-wide corridor, or 12.5 feet on either side of the Project's centerline. To accommodate additional areas beyond the footprint of the trench that may be necessary for laydown/staging areas, and to accommodate indirect effects of Project construction activities, the APE for this undertaking has been defined to include an area encompassing 25 feet on either side of the Project's centerline. The APE may be further refined through additional engineering analyses.

The proposed indirect APE is defined as a one mile wide area surrounding the converter station site. This is the area within which indirect impacts and effects of project components on cultural resources and/or historic properties would be considered.

Presently, DOE requests your concurrence on the proposed direct and indirect APEs for this project as outlined above.

If you have any questions or concerns, you may contact me at [Brian.Mills@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Brian.Mills@hq.doe.gov) or (202)586-8267. Please accept my thanks for your continued assistance with and participation in the Section 106 consultation process.

Sincerely,



Mr. Brian Mills  
Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability  
U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20585

Attachments:

February 06, 2015 Letter

# **APPENDIX J ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ANALYSIS BACKGROUND**

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

---

# A Profile of Demographics

County Region

State of Vermont, Addison County VT, Chittenden County VT, Grand Isle County VT,  
Rutland County VT, Windsor County VT

Produced by  
**Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit**  
**EPS-HDT**  
March 29, 2015

---

## About the Economic Profile System-Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS-HDT)

EPS-HDT is a free, easy-to-use software application that produces detailed socioeconomic reports of counties, states, and regions, including custom aggregations. In addition to these geographies, the Demographics report can be run for county subdivisions, cities and towns, American Indian areas, and congressional districts.

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from federal data sources, including Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have made significant financial and intellectual contributions to the operation and content of EPS-HDT.

See [headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt](http://headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt) for more information about the other tools and capabilities of EPS-HDT.

For technical questions, contact Patty Gude at [eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org](mailto:eps-hdt@headwaterseconomics.org), or 406-599-7425.



**Headwaters Economics** is an independent, nonprofit research group. Our mission is to improve community development and land management decisions in the West.



[www.blm.gov](http://www.blm.gov)

**The Bureau of Land Management**, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, administers 249.8 million acres of America's public lands, located primarily in 12 Western States. It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.



[www.fs.fed.us](http://www.fs.fed.us)

**The Forest Service**, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, administers national forests and grasslands encompassing 193 million acres. The Forest Service's mission is to achieve quality land management under the "sustainable multiple-use management concept" to meet the diverse needs of people while protecting the resource. Significant intellectual, conceptual, and content contributions were provided by the following individuals: Dr. Pat Reed, Dr. Jessica Montag, Doug Smith, M.S., Fred Clark, M.S., Dr. Susan A. Winter, and Dr. Ashley Goldhor-Wilcock.

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Demographics</b>	Page
How has population changed?	1
What is the age and gender distribution of the population?	2-3
What is the racial makeup of the population?	4
What is the Hispanic makeup of the population?	5
What is the tribal makeup of the population?	6-7
<b>Employment</b>	
What occupations and industries are present?	8
What are the characteristics of labor participation?	9
What are commuting patterns?	10
<b>Income</b>	
How is income distributed?	11
What are poverty levels?	12-13
What are the components of household earnings?	14
<b>Social Characteristics</b>	
What are education and enrollment levels?	15
What languages are spoken?	16
<b>Housing</b>	
What are the main housing characteristics?	17
How affordable is housing?	18
<b>Benchmarks</b>	
How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.?	19
<b>Data Sources &amp; Methods</b>	20
<b>Links to Additional Resources</b>	21

## Note to Users:

Because ACS is based on a survey, it is subject to error. The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error (MOE) for every data point. In this report, we alert the user to the data accuracy using color-coded text in the tables: BLACK indicates a coefficient of variation (CV) < 12%; ORANGE (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and RED BOLD (preceded with two dots) indicates a CV > 40%.

This report is one of fourteen reports that can be produced with the EPS-HDT software. You may want to run another EPS-HDT report for either a different geography or topic. Topics include land use, demographics, specific industry sectors, the role of non-labor income, the wildland-urban interface, the role of amenities in economic development, and payments to county governments from federal lands. Throughout the reports, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks on each report's final page. The EPS-HDT software also allows the user to "push" the tables, figures, and interpretive text from a report to a Word document. For further information and to download the free software, go to:

[headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt](http://headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt)

How has population changed?

This page describes the total population and change in total population.


Note: with the exception of some 2000 Decennial Census data used on pages 1-3, all other data used in this report are from the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau. Red, orange, and black text indicate different data quality thresholds – please read the Methods section in the Study Guide text.

Population, 2000-2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
Population (2013*)	625,904	36,811	157,637	6,984	61,270	56,416	319,118	311,536,594
Population (2000)	608,827	35,974	146,571	6,901	63,400	57,418	310,264	281,421,906
Population Change (2000-2013*)	17,077	837	11,066	83	-2,130	-1,002	8,854	30,114,688
Population Percent Change (2000-2013*)	2.8%	2.3%	7.5%	1.2%	-3.4%	-1.7%	2.9%	10.7%

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

- From 2000 to the 2009-2013 period, Rutland County, VT had the smallest estimated absolute change in population (-2,130).
- From 2000 to the 2009-2013 period, U.S. had the largest estimated relative change in population (10.7%), and Rutland County, VT had the smallest (-3.4%).



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.

## Population, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
Population (2013*)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Population (2000)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Population Change (2000-2013*)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Population Percent Change (2000-2013*)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%



## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### How has population changed?

#### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes the total population and change in total population.

Note: with the exception of some 2000 Decennial Census data used on pages 1-3, all other data used in this report are from the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau. Red, orange, and black text indicate different data quality thresholds – please read the Methods section below.

#### Why is this important?

This report covers a broad range of characteristics including gender, race, age, employment status, income levels, education, and home ownership. It is the only EPS-HDT report that can be run for geographic areas other than the U.S., states, and counties. These include cities, towns, and census designated places, American Indian, Alaska native, and native Hawaii areas, congressional districts, and county subdivisions.

In addition to its usefulness for social research, the information throughout this report is valuable for public land managers and others in identifying whether the selected geographies contain minorities and people who are economically and/or socially disadvantaged. This is important because Executive Order 12898, February 11, 1994 states 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..." (see Additional Resources on Page 2 of this report for more references).

While the data in this report does not constitute an analysis of environmental justice per se, it serves to identify whether minorities and/or economically/socially disadvantaged people live in an area. The assessment of whether environmental justice pertains to an area or management action requires consideration of the presence and distribution of minority individuals, minority populations, and low income populations and whether they are or would be disproportionately subject to high and adverse human health effects (such as bodily impairment, infirmity, illness, or any other negative health effects from cumulative or multiple adverse exposures to environmental hazards), and disproportionately high and adverse environmental effects (such as impacts on the natural environment that significantly or adversely affect minority, low income, or native populations).

#### Methods

The majority of data in this report comes from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS is a nation-wide survey conducted every year by the Census Bureau that provides current demographic, social, economic, and housing information about communities every year—information that until recently was only available once a decade. The ACS is not the same as the decennial census, which is conducted every ten years (the ACS has replaced the detailed, Census 2000 long-form questionnaire).

For populations of 65,000 or more, ACS provides estimates based on 1 year of sampling. For populations of 20,000 or more, ACS provides estimates based on 3 years of sampling. For all other geographies, estimates based on 5 years of sampling are provided. Data used in this report are 5-year ACS estimates. More so than the 1 or 3-year estimates, the 5-year estimates are consistently available for small geographies, such as towns. We show 5-year estimates for all geographies since data obtained using the same survey technique is ideal for cross-geography comparisons. The disadvantage is that multiyear estimates cannot be used to describe any particular year in the period, only what the average value is over the full period. For brevity, table and figure titles show the latest year of the 5-year period. Footnotes are provided to clarify that the data represent average characteristics over a 5-year period.

ACS is based on a survey, and is subject to error. The Census Bureau reports the accuracy of the data by providing margins of error. In this report, we alert the user to the data accuracy using color-coded text and symbols in the tables: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. Less populated areas tend to have lower accuracy. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale. A listing of all coefficients of variation by data point can be found by scrolling down to the tables provided below the border of the page in the Excel workbook.

#### Additional Resources

An indispensable publication on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. Environmental Justice: Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: [epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\\_guidance\\_nepa\\_ceq1297.pdf](http://epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej_guidance_nepa_ceq1297.pdf) <sup>(1)</sup>.

For a description of the Census Bureau's ACS survey methodology and data accuracy used by the Census Bureau, see:

[census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology\\_main/](http://census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology_main/) <sup>(2)</sup>.

[census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\\_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf](http://census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf) <sup>(3)</sup>.

#### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.

Study Guide

What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

This page describes population distribution by age and gender, and the change in median age.

**Median Age:** The age which divides the population into two numerically equal groups; i.e, half the people are younger than this age and half are older.

Age & Gender Distribution, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Population</b>	625,904	36,811	157,637	6,984	61,270	56,416	319,118	311,536,594
Under 5 years	31,237	1,626	7,737	307	2,720	2,668	15,058	20,052,112
5 to 9 years	34,213	2,008	8,370	365	2,939	3,069	16,751	20,409,060
10 to 14 years	36,991	2,103	8,899	401	3,683	3,176	18,262	20,672,609
15 to 19 years	45,658	3,178	13,826	430	4,217	3,200	24,851	21,715,074
20 to 24 years	44,404	3,103	16,719	309	4,139	2,492	26,762	22,099,887
25 to 29 years	35,421	1,692	11,094	301	3,157	3,226	19,470	21,243,365
30 to 34 years	34,840	1,811	9,898	356	2,918	3,039	18,022	20,467,912
35 to 39 years	34,431	1,839	8,923	335	3,014	2,675	16,786	19,876,161
40 to 44 years	42,186	2,565	10,632	562	4,062	3,834	21,655	20,998,001
45 to 49 years	47,199	2,831	11,287	603	4,769	4,308	23,798	22,109,946
50 to 54 years	51,924	3,051	12,279	673	5,223	4,940	26,166	22,396,322
55 to 59 years	49,813	3,037	10,640	639	5,211	4,781	24,308	20,165,892
60 to 64 years	42,509	2,536	8,704	644	4,614	4,507	21,005	17,479,211
65 to 69 years	31,178	1,856	6,089	442	3,465	3,375	15,227	13,189,508
70 to 74 years	21,906	1,212	4,114	242	2,441	2,509	10,518	9,767,522
75 to 79 years	16,415	985	3,097	147	1,813	1,805	7,847	7,438,750
80 to 84 years	13,147	679	2,632	124	1,527	1,434	6,396	5,781,697
85 years and over	12,432	699	2,697	104	1,358	1,378	6,236	5,673,565
<b>Total Female</b>	317,360	18,406	80,722	3,497	31,006	28,728	162,359	158,289,182
<b>Total Male</b>	308,544	18,405	76,915	3,487	30,264	27,688	156,759	153,247,412


Change in Median Age, 2000-2013\*

Median Age^ (2013*)	42.0	42.3	36.3	46.3	44.8	45.8	na	37.3
Median Age^ (2000)	37.7	36.1	34.2	40.1	39.5	41.3	na	35.3
Median Age % Change	11.4%	17.2%	6.1%	15.5%	13.4%	10.9%	na	5.7%

^ Median age is not available for metro/non-metro or regional aggregations.

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

- From 2000 to the 2009-2013 period, the median age estimate increased the most in Addison County, VT (36.1 to 42.3, a 17.2% increase) and increased the least in the U.S. (35.3 to 37.3, a 5.7% increase).



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.

## Age & Gender Distribution, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
Total Population	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Under 5 years	0.4%	1.2%	0.5%	1.8%	0.9%	2.3%	0.5%	0.0%
5 to 9 years	1.4%	4.0%	3.1%	8.2%	4.9%	4.7%	2.0%	0.1%
10 to 14 years	1.3%	3.8%	3.0%	8.5%	4.0%	4.5%	1.9%	0.1%
15 to 19 years	0.4%	1.5%	0.7%	3.8%	1.2%	1.1%	0.5%	0.0%
20 to 24 years	1.5%	4.8%	2.7%	9.8%	4.7%	5.7%	2.0%	0.1%
25 to 29 years	0.4%	3.1%	0.7%	2.2%	0.8%	1.8%	0.6%	0.0%
30 to 34 years	0.4%	1.5%	0.9%	2.4%	1.1%	1.6%	0.6%	0.0%
35 to 39 years	1.4%	4.7%	3.1%	11.4%	4.6%	5.0%	2.1%	0.1%
40 to 44 years	1.1%	3.5%	2.6%	7.8%	3.6%	3.6%	1.6%	0.1%
45 to 49 years	0.3%	1.0%	0.7%	2.4%	0.7%	1.0%	0.4%	0.0%
50 to 54 years	0.3%	1.2%	0.7%	2.3%	0.5%	0.7%	0.4%	0.0%
55 to 59 years	1.0%	3.2%	2.6%	7.0%	3.0%	3.1%	1.5%	0.1%
60 to 64 years	1.4%	4.3%	3.9%	7.5%	4.0%	3.8%	2.1%	0.1%
65 to 69 years	1.4%	4.3%	3.8%	8.0%	4.5%	4.3%	2.1%	0.1%
70 to 74 years	1.4%	5.5%	4.2%	10.0%	4.3%	4.3%	2.3%	0.1%
75 to 79 years	1.9%	6.6%	4.6%	12.4%	5.1%	6.5%	2.8%	0.1%
80 to 84 years	2.2%	8.6%	6.3%	18.6%	5.8%	7.4%	3.5%	0.1%
85 years and over	2.3%	7.4%	5.3%	13.4%	6.1%	8.2%	3.3%	0.1%
Total Female	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%
Total Male	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%
Median Age^ (2013*)	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	na	0.2%
Median Age^ (2000)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	na	0.0%
Median Age % Change	2.8%	2.9%	5.8%	3.9%	2.3%	2.7%	na	3.0%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes population distribution by age and gender, and the change in median age.

**Median Age:** The age which divides the population into two numerically equal groups; i.e., half the people are younger than this age and half are older.

### Why is it important?

Different geographies can have different age distributions. For example, in counties with a large number of retirees, the age distribution may be skewed towards categories 65 years and older. In counties with universities, the age distribution will be skewed toward the age group 18-29. In many counties, the largest segment of the population is in the Baby Boomer generation (people born between 1946 and 1964).

The change in median age is one indicator of whether the population has gotten older or younger.

### Methods

Data in this report are based on the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau. Data used in this report are 5-year estimates for all geographies. The latest year of the 5-year estimate is indicated in tables and figures (for example, 2009\* may be listed as the year, but this is a 5-year estimate based on data collected from 2005 through 2009).

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

### Additional Resources

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies." Environmental Protection Agency environmental justice resources are available at: [epa.gov/compliance/ej](http://epa.gov/compliance/ej) <sup>(4)</sup>.

An indispensable publication on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. Environmental Justice: Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: [epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\\_guidance\\_nepa\\_ceq1297.pdf](http://epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej_guidance_nepa_ceq1297.pdf) <sup>(1)</sup>.

The nonprofit organization The State of the USA is developing a national indicator system using consistent measures of well-being. Their resources are available at: [stateoftheusa.org](http://stateoftheusa.org) <sup>(9)</sup>.

A useful resource on rural population change is the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service's Briefing Room on "Rural Population and Migration" available at: [ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx](http://ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx) <sup>(6)</sup>.

William H. Frey's website provides links to publications, issues, media stories, data tools and resources on migration, population redistribution, and demography of both rural and urban populations in the U.S.: [frey-demographer.org](http://frey-demographer.org) <sup>(7)</sup>.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration on Aging has a host of resources on older Americans at: [aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging\\_statistics/index.aspx](http://aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging_statistics/index.aspx) <sup>(8)</sup>.

The U.S. Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program publishes age data estimates for the U.S., states, counties, and metropolitan areas. This information is available at: <http://www.census.gov/popest/> <sup>(9)</sup>.

For information on county-level health ranking, see: [countyhealthrankings.org/](http://countyhealthrankings.org/) <sup>(10)</sup>.

### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.

What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age distribution, with age categories separated into five age groups.

Age & Gender Distribution and Change, 2000-2013\*


	2000	2013*
<b>Total Population</b>	310,264	319,118
Under 18	73,314	62,012
18-34	72,138	77,164
35-44	52,530	38,441
45-64	75,034	95,277
65 and over	37,248	46,224

Percent of Total

	2000	2013*
Under 18	23.6%	19.4%
18-34	23.3%	24.2%
35-44	16.9%	12.0%
45-64	24.2%	29.9%
65 and over	12.0%	14.5%

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

- In the 2009-2013 period, the age category with the highest estimate for number of women was 45-64 (48,727), and the age category with the highest estimate for number of men was 45-64 (46,550).
- From 2000 to the 2009-2013 period, the age category with the largest estimated increase was 45-64 (20,243), and the age category with the largest estimated decrease was 35-44 (-14,089).



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.

### Age & Gender Distribution and Change, Coefficients of Variation

	2000	2009*
Total Population	0%	0%
Under 18	0%	1%
18-34	0%	1%
35-44	0%	1%
45-64	0%	1%
65 and over	0%	1%

### Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation

	2000	2009*
Under 18	0%	0%
18-34	0%	0%
35-44	0%	0%
45-64	0%	0%
65 and over	0%	0%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What is the age and gender distribution of the population?

#### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes the change in age and gender distribution over time, and the change in age distribution, with age categories separated into five age groups.

#### Why is it important?

For public land managers, understanding the age distribution can help highlight whether management actions might affect some age groups more than others. It also may highlight the need to understand the different needs, values, and attitudes of different age groups. If a geography has a large retired population, or soon-to-be-retired population, for example, the needs and interests of the public may place different demands on public land managers than a geography with a large number of minors or young adults.

For many geographies, a significant development is the aging of the population, and in particular the retirement of the "Baby Boomer" generation (those born between 1946 and 1964). As this generation enters retirement age, their mobility, spending patterns, and consumer demands (for health care and housing, for example) can affect how communities develop economically. An aging population can also affect changing demands on land use (e.g., recreation).

#### Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

#### Additional Resources

The non-profit Population Reference Bureau offers a helpful video on population pyramids at: [prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx](http://prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx) <sup>(11)</sup>.

For a discussion on the implications of rising age trends, see: Peterson, Peter, G. 1999. *Gray Dawn: How the Coming Age Wave Will Transform America—and the World*. Random House. New York, New York. 280 p.

The Census maintains a useful web site with data, articles, and PowerPoint presentations on the characteristics of different age groups: [census.gov/population/age/](http://census.gov/population/age/) <sup>(12)</sup>.

The Next Four Decades: Older Population in the United States: 2010 to 2050. May 2010. Census Bureau. [census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf](http://census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf) <sup>(13)</sup>.

Cromartie, J. and P. Nelson. 2009. *Baby Boom Migration and Its Impact on Rural America*. Economic Research Service, Report Number 29. Washington, DC. [ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx](http://ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx) <sup>(14)</sup>.

Frey, W.H. 2006. *America's Regional Demographics in the '00 Decade: The Role of Seniors, Boomers and New Minorities*. The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Frey, W. H. 2007. *Mapping the Growth of Older America: Seniors and Boomers in the Early 21st Century*. Brookings Census 2000 Series. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program.

Jacobsen, L. A., and Mather, M. 2010. "U.S. Social and Economic Trends Since 2000." *Population Bulletin* 65(1): 1-16. Washington D.C.: Population Reference Bureau.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2005. "State Interim Population Projections by Age and Sex: 2004-2030." [census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html](http://census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html) <sup>(15)</sup>. Retrieved September 1, 2010.

#### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of Commerce. 2000. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division, Washington, D.C.

What is the racial makeup of the population?

This page describes the number of people who self-identify as belonging to a particular race.

**Race:** Race is a self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identify. The Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race and ethnicity.

Population by Race, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Population</b>	625,904	36,811	157,637	6,984	61,270	56,416	319,118	311,536,594
White alone	595,862	35,166	145,443	6,656	59,409	54,337	301,011	230,592,579
Black or African American alone	6,139	317	3,128	22	298	310	4,075	39,167,010
American Indian alone	1,841	93	432	49	134	123	831	2,540,309
Asian alone	7,922	605	4,467	20	358	465	5,915	15,231,962
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	145	31	8	0	0	0	39	526,347
Some other race alone	1,744	62	660	1	259	180	1,162	14,746,054
Two or more races	12,251	537	3,499	236	812	1,001	6,085	8,732,333


Percent of Total

White alone	95.2%	95.5%	92.3%	95.3%	97.0%	96.3%	94.3%	74.0%
Black or African American alone	1.0%	0.9%	2.0%	0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	1.3%	12.6%
American Indian alone	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.8%
Asian alone	1.3%	1.6%	2.8%	0.3%	0.6%	0.8%	1.9%	4.9%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Some other race alone	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	4.7%
Two or more races	2.0%	1.5%	2.2%	3.4%	1.3%	1.8%	1.9%	2.8%

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

Population by Race, Percent of Total, County Region, 2013\*

- In the 2009-2013 period, the racial category with the highest estimated percent of the population in the County Region was White alone (94.3%), and the racial category the lowest estimated percent of the population was Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone (0.0%).



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.



### Population by Race, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
Total Population	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
White alone	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Black or African American alone	3%	10%	4%	72%	14%	13%	4%	0%
American Indian alone	9%	19%	17%	46%	27%	37%	12%	0%
Asian alone	3%	5%	4%	33%	13%	16%	3%	0%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	31%	71%	68%	na	na	na	78%	1%
Some other race	13%	32%	24%	122%	40%	32%	17%	0%
Two or more races	3%	9%	7%	13%	8%	11%	5%	1%

### Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
White alone	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Black or African American alone	6%	7%	3%	77%	12%	11%	5%	0%
American Indian alone	0%	24%	22%	43%	28%	28%	23%	0%
Asian alone	5%	4%	4%	42%	10%	15%	3%	0%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Is. alone	0%	72%	0%	na	na	na	0%	0%
Some other race	22%	36%	29%	0%	43%	38%	17%	0%
Two or more races	3%	8%	8%	13%	9%	10%	3%	0%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What is the racial makeup of the population?

#### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes the number of people who self-identify as belonging to a particular race.

**Race:** Race is a self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identify. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race and ethnicity.

**Race Alone Categories:** This includes the minimum five race categories required by the OMB, plus the 'some other race alone' included by the Census Bureau, with the approval of the OMB. The categories are: White alone, Black or African-American alone, American Indian or Alaska Native alone, Asian alone, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander alone, and Some other race alone.

**Some Other Race:** This includes all other responses not included in the "White," "Black or African American," "American Indian and Alaska Native," "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" race categories described above. Respondents providing write-in entries such as multiracial, mixed, interracial, or a Hispanic/Latino group (for example, Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban) in the "Some other race" write-in space are included in this category.

**Two or More Races:** People may have chosen to provide two or more races either by checking two or more race response check boxes, by providing multiple write-in responses, or by some combination of check boxes and write-in responses.

#### Why is it important?

Federal agencies make use of information on race and ethnicity for implementing a number of programs, while also using this information to promote and enforce equal opportunities, such as in employment or housing, under the Civil Rights Act.

According to the Census Bureau, "Many federal programs are put into effect based on the race data obtained from the decennial census (i.e., promoting equal employment opportunities; assessing racial disparities in health and environmental risks)." In addition, "Data on ethnic groups are important for putting into effect a number of federal statutes (i.e., enforcing bilingual election rules under the Voting Rights Act; monitoring and enforcing equal employment opportunities under the Civil Rights Act). Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local governments to run programs and meet legislative requirements (i.e., identifying segments of the population who may not be receiving medical services under the Public Health Act; evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community Reinvestment Act)."

For public land managers, one of the important considerations of proposed management actions is whether the action could have disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority populations. This consideration, broadly referred to as "Environmental Justice", is a requirement of Executive Order 12898. The data on this page show which minority populations are represented, but does not analyze whether there is a potential environmental justice issue.

#### Methods

Race categories include both racial and national-origin groups. The concept of race is separate from the concept of Hispanic origin, which is discussed elsewhere in this report. Percentages for the various race categories add to 100 percent, and should not be combined with the percent Hispanic.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

#### Additional Resources

For information on revised Federal Office of Management and Budget standards for the classification of Federal data on race and ethnicity (1997), see: [whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg\\_1997standards](http://whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg_1997standards) <sup>(16)</sup>.

For a primer on how the Census 2000 handles race and Hispanic origin, see the U.S. Census Bureau's publication "Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin," available at: [census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf](http://census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf) <sup>(17)</sup>.

Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: [factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml](http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml) <sup>(18)</sup>.

The American Human Development Project has created a useful resource on the health and welfare of racial and ethnic groups. It is called *A Century Apart: New Measures of Well-Being for U.S. Racial and Ethnic Groups* and is available at: [measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart](http://measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart) <sup>(19)</sup>.

#### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

What is the Hispanic makeup of the population?

This page describes the number of people who self-identify as Hispanic. The information also is presented according to race. The term "Hispanic" refers to a cultural identification, and Hispanics can be of any race.

**Hispanic or Latino Origin:** People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Mexican," "Puerto Rican," or "Cuban" as well as those who indicate that they are "other Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino." 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.

Hispanic Population, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Population</b>	625,904	36,811	157,637	6,984	61,270	56,416	319,118	311,536,594
<b>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</b>	9,803	701	3,043	93	738	734	5,309	51,786,591
<b>Not Hispanic or Latino</b>	616,101	36,110	154,594	6,891	60,532	55,682	313,809	259,750,003
White alone	588,820	34,592	143,191	6,591	58,961	53,849	297,184	197,050,418
Black or African American alone	5,964	303	3,072	22	295	310	4,002	38,093,998
American Indian alone	1,693	91	325	46	128	120	710	2,061,752
Asian alone	7,835	605	4,442	20	358	430	5,855	15,061,411
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	108	31	8	0	0	0	39	488,646
Some other race	508	12	274	0	13	7	306	606,356
Two or more races	11,173	476	3,282	212	777	966	5,713	6,387,422


Percent of Total

<b>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</b>	1.6%	1.9%	1.9%	1.3%	1.2%	1.3%	1.7%	16.6%
<b>Not Hispanic or Latino</b>	98.4%	98.1%	98.1%	98.7%	98.8%	98.7%	98.3%	83.4%
White alone	94.1%	94.0%	90.8%	94.4%	96.2%	95.4%	93.1%	63.3%
Black or African American alone	1.0%	0.8%	1.9%	0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	1.3%	12.2%
American Indian alone	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.7%
Asian alone	1.3%	1.6%	2.8%	0.3%	0.6%	0.8%	1.8%	4.8%
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Some other race	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%
Two or more races	1.8%	1.3%	2.1%	3.0%	1.3%	1.7%	1.8%	2.1%

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

- In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of the population that self-identify as Hispanic or Latino of any race (16.6%), and Rutland County, VT had the lowest (1.2%).

Hispanic Population, Percent of Total, County Region, 2013\*



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

### Hispanic Population, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Population</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Not Hispanic or Latino</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
White alone	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Black or African American alone	3%	10%	4%	72%	14%	13%	4%	0%
American Indian alone	9%	19%	20%	49%	28%	37%	13%	0%
Asian alone	3%	5%	4%	33%	13%	16%	3%	0%
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	34%	71%	68%	na	na	na	78%	1%
Some other race	27%	81%	48%	na	47%	87%	43%	1%
Two or more races	3%	9%	8%	14%	8%	11%	5%	0%

### Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Not Hispanic or Latino</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
White alone	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Black or African American alone	6%	7%	3%	77%	13%	11%	5%	0%
American Indian alone	0%	25%	29%	46%	29%	29%	0%	0%
Asian alone	5%	4%	4%	42%	10%	16%	3%	0%
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	0%	72%	0%	na	na	na	0%	0%
Some other race	0%	0%	35%	na	0%	0%	63%	0%
Two or more races	3%	9%	9%	14%	10%	11%	3%	0%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What is the Hispanic makeup of the population?

#### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes the number of people who self-identify as Hispanic. The information also is presented according to race. The term "Hispanic" refers to a cultural identification, and Hispanics can be of any race.

**Ethnicity:** There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal government considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race.

**Hispanic or Latino Origin:** People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the Census questionnaire "Mexican," "Puerto Rican," or "Cuban" as well as those who indicate that they are "other Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino." 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.

#### Why is it important?

Hispanics are one of the fastest growing segments of the U.S. population. The Census Bureau reported that 15 percent of the population in the U.S. self-identified as being Hispanic in 2010. The Census Bureau predicts that 24.4 percent of the population in the U.S. will be Hispanic by 2050. Between 2000 and 2010, Hispanics accounted for over one-half of the nation's population growth.

Different groups of people may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of the Hispanic community in an area can be an important consideration for public land managers working to meet the needs of the public or evaluating potentially adverse impacts on a population.

According to the Census Bureau: "Many federal programs are put into effect based on the race data obtained from the decennial census (i.e., promoting equal employment opportunities; assessing racial disparities in health and environmental risks)" and "Data on ethnic groups are important for putting into effect a number of federal statutes (i.e., enforcing bilingual election rules under the Voting Rights Act; monitoring and enforcing equal employment opportunities under the Civil Rights Act). Data on Ethnic Groups are also needed by local governments to run programs and meet legislative requirements (i.e., identifying segments of the population who may not be receiving medical services under the Public Health Act; evaluating whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minority populations under the Community Reinvestment Act)."

#### Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

#### Additional Resources

For information on revised Federal Office of Management and Budget standards for the classification of Federal data on race and ethnicity (1997), see: [whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg\\_1997standards](http://whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg_1997standards) <sup>(16)</sup>.

For a primer on how the Census 2000 handles race and Hispanic origin, see the U.S. Census Bureau publication "Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin," available at: [census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf](http://census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf) <sup>(17)</sup>.

Additional race and ethnicity data from the U.S. Census Bureau can be found at: [factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml](http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml) <sup>(18)</sup>.

Additional information on the U.S. Hispanic population from the U.S. Census Bureau is available at: [census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22\\_cspan\\_hispanics.pdf](http://census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22_cspan_hispanics.pdf) <sup>(20)</sup>.

For an analysis of Latinos and Hispanics and federal land management in the Columbia River Basin, as well as a literature review on the subject, see: [icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard\\_10pg.pdf](http://icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard_10pg.pdf) <sup>(21)</sup>.

#### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

What is the tribal makeup of the population?

This page describes, in general terms, the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races.

**American Indian:** This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian descent. Many American Indians are members of a principal tribe or group empowered to negotiate and make decisions on behalf of the individual members. Census data are available for 34 tribes or Selected American Indian categories: Apache, Blackfeet, Cherokee, Cheyenne, Chickasaw, Chippewa, Choctaw, Colville, Comanche, Cree, Creek, Crow, Delaware, Houma, Iroquois, Kiowa, Lumbee, Menominee, Navajo, Osage, Ottawa, Paiute, Pima, Potawatomi, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminole, Shoshone, Sioux, Tohomo O’Odham, Ute, Yakama, Yaqui, Yuman, and All other.

**Alaska Native:** This category shows self-identification among people of Alaska Native descent. Census data are available for five detailed Alaska Native race and ethnic categories: Alaska Athabaskan, Aleut, Eskimo, Tlingit-Haida, and All other tribes.

**Non-Specified Tribes:** This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian or Alaska Native decent that does not fall within a major tribal affiliation.

American Indian & Alaska Native Population, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Population</b>	625,904	36,811	157,637	6,984	61,270	56,416	319,118	311,536,594
<b>Total Native American</b>	1,841	93	432	49	134	123	831	2,540,309
American Indian Tribes	1,217	64	195	29	77	80	445	1,997,487
Alaska Native Tribes	15	0	0	0	12	0	12	108,836
Non-Specified Tribes	575	27	215	20	42	43	347	363,000


Percent of Total

<b>Total Native American</b>	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.8%
American Indian Tribes	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%
Alaska Native Tribes	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Non-Specified Tribes	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

Native American Population, Percent of Total, County Region, 2013\*

- In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of the population that self-identified as American Indian and Alaska Native (0.8%) and Windsor County, VT had the lowest (0.2%).



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

**American Indian & Alaska Native Population, Coefficients of Variation**

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Population</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Total Native American</b>	9%	19%	17%	46%	27%	37%	12%	0%
American Indian Tribes	11%	26%	31%	55%	45%	35%	18%	0%
Alaska Native Tribes	53%	na	na	na	66%	na	209%	1%
Non-Specified Tribes	18%	41%	31%	70%	43%	75%	23%	1%

**Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation**

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Native American</b>	0%	24%	22%	43%	28%	28%	23%	0%
American Indian Tribes	0%	35%	49%	59%	48%	43%	0%	0%
Alaska Native Tribes	0%	na	na	na	0%	na	0%	0%
Non-Specified Tribes	0%	0%	45%	64%	0%	80%	0%	0%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What is the tribal makeup of the population?

#### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes, in general terms, the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races.

**American Indian:** This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian descent. Many American Indians are members of a principal tribe or group empowered to negotiate and make decisions on behalf of the individual members. Census data are available for 34 tribes or Selected American Indian categories: Apache, Blackfeet, Cherokee, Cheyenne, Chickasaw, Chippewa, Choctaw, Colville, Comanche, Cree, Creek, Crow, Delaware, Houma, Iroquois, Kiowa, Lumbee, Menominee, Navajo, Osage, Ottawa, Paiute, Pima, Potawatomi, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminole, Shoshone, Sioux, Tohomo O'Odham, Ute, Yakama, Yaqui, Yuman, and All other.

**Alaska Native:** This category shows self-identification among people of Alaska Native descent. Census data are available for five detailed Alaska Native race and ethnic categories: Alaska Athabaskan, Aleut, Eskimo, Tlingit-Haida, and All other tribes.

**Non-Specified Tribes:** This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native," or tribal entries not elsewhere classified.

#### Why is it important?

Different groups of people may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of American Indian and Alaska Native tribes is an important consideration for public land managers where these populations reside and have a historical and/or current tie to the land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helpful to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

#### Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

#### Additional Resources

An indispensable publication on environmental justice: Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. Environmental Justice: Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act. Washington, D.C. Available at: [epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\\_guidance\\_nepa\\_ceq1297.pdf](http://epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej_guidance_nepa_ceq1297.pdf) <sup>(1)</sup>.

The U.S. Department of Interior's Indian Affairs oversees the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education. Indian Affairs resources and contacts are available at: [bia.gov/index.htm](http://bia.gov/index.htm) <sup>(22)</sup>.

The American Indian Heritage Foundation hosts an American Indian Resource Directory with a list of all American Indian tribes, including Federally recognized tribes, and the Native Wire news service. These and other resources are available at: [indians.org/index.html](http://indians.org/index.html) <sup>(23)</sup>.

#### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.



What is the tribal makeup of the population?

This page describes the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races.

American Indian & Alaska Native Population, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Population</b>	625,904	36,811	157,637	6,984	61,270	56,416	319,118	311,536,594
<b>Total Native American</b>	1,841	93	432	49	134	123	831	2,540,309
<b>American Indian Tribes; Specified</b>	1,217	64	195	29	77	80	445	1,997,487
Apache	5	0	0	0	3	0	3	69,740
Blackfeet	57	0	8	0	0	3	11	26,474
Cherokee	88	4	0	0	0	14	18	273,192
Cheyenne	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,774
Chickasaw	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	22,917
Chippewa	52	0	10	0	10	1	21	115,253
Choctaw	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	90,189
Colville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,182
Comanche	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,228
Cree	6	3	0	0	0	0	3	2,191
Creek	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	41,521
Crow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,424
Delaware	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,471
Houma	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,488
Iroquois	41	0	29	0	0	2	31	45,639
Kiowa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,691
Lumbee	21	21	0	0	0	0	21	68,171
Menominee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,259
Navajo	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	305,552
Osage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,332
Ottawa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,026
Paiute	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,545
Pima	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,212
Potawatomi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19,337
Pueblo	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	71,029
Puget Sound Salish	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	13,971
Seminole	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13,987
Shoshone	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,470
Sioux	30	0	14	0	0	6	20	124,383
Tohono O'Odham	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,343
Ute	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,629
Yakama	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,614
Yaqui	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19,942
Yuman	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,944
All other tribes	871	36	134	29	64	48	311	491,367
<b>American Indian; Not Specified</b>	34	2	22	0	3	0	27	60,370
<b>Alaska Native Tribes; Specified</b>	15	0	0	0	12	0	12	108,836
Alaska Athabaskan	15	0	0	0	12	0	12	15,882
Aleut	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,709
Eskimo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60,926
Tlingit-Haida	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15,622
All other tribes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,697
<b>Alaska Native; Not Specified</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,616
<b>American Indian or Alaska Native; Not Specified</b>	575	27	215	20	42	43	347	363,000

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## American Indian & Alaska Native Population, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Population</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Total Native American</b>	9%	19%	17%	46%	27%	37%	12%	0%
<b>American Indian Tribes; Specified</b>	11%	26%	31%	55%	45%	35%	18%	0%
Apache	61%	na	na	na	81%	na	799%	2%
Blackfeet	43%	na	114%	na	na	101%	199%	3%
Cherokee	30%	91%	na	na	na	104%	141%	1%
Cheyenne	152%	na	na	na	na	na	na	6%
Chickasaw	122%	na	na	na	na	122%	492%	3%
Chippewa	62%	na	91%	na	91%	122%	93%	1%
Choctaw	96%	na	na	na	na	na	na	1%
Colville	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	5%
Comanche	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	6%
Cree	71%	81%	na	na	na	na	820%	11%
Creek	122%	na	na	na	na	na	na	2%
Crow	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	5%
Delaware	87%	na	na	na	na	na	na	7%
Houma	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	6%
Iroquois	55%	na	73%	na	na	91%	94%	2%
Kiowa	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	7%
Lumbee	58%	58%	na	na	na	na	130%	1%
Menominee	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	4%
Navajo	127%	na	na	na	na	na	na	1%
Osage	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	6%
Ottawa	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	7%
Paiute	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	4%
Pima	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	4%
Potawatomi	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	3%
Pueblo	91%	na	na	na	na	na	na	2%
Puget Sound Salish	122%	na	na	na	na	122%	2386%	4%
Seminole	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	4%
Shoshone	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	5%
Sioux	57%	na	96%	na	na	111%	124%	1%
Tohono O'Odham	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	5%
Ute	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	6%
Yakama	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	5%
Yaqui	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	5%
Yuman	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	6%
All other tribes	16%	42%	41%	55%	52%	44%	23%	1%
<b>American Indian; Not Specified</b>	52%	91%	69%	na	122%	na	82%	3%
<b>Alaska Native Tribes; Specified</b>	53%	na	na	na	66%	na	209%	1%
Alaska Athabaskan	53%	na	na	na	66%	na	209%	4%
Aleut	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	5%
Eskimo	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	1%
Tlingit-Haida	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	4%
All other tribes	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	6%
<b>Alaska Native; Not Specified</b>	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	6%
<b>American Indian or Alaska Native; Not Sp</b>	18%	41%	31%	70%	43%	75%	23%	1%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What is the tribal makeup of the population?

#### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes, in general terms, the number of people who self-identify as American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races.

**American Indian:** This category shows self-identification among people of American Indian descent. Many American Indians are members of a principal tribe or group empowered to negotiate and make decisions on behalf of the individual members. Census data are available for 34 tribes or Selected American Indian categories: Apache, Blackfeet, Cherokee, Cheyenne, Chickasaw, Chippewa, Choctaw, Colville, Comanche, Cree, Creek, Crow, Delaware, Houma, Iroquois, Kiowa, Lumbee, Menominee, Navajo, Osage, Ottawa, Paiute, Pima, Potawatomi, Pueblo, Puget Sound Salish, Seminole, Shoshone, Sioux, Tohomo O'Dodham, Ute, Yakama, Yaqui, Yuman, and All other.

**Alaska Native:** This category shows self-identification among people of Alaska Native descent. Census data are available for five detailed Alaska Native race and ethnic categories: Alaska Athabaskan, Aleut, Eskimo, Tlingit-Haida, and All other tribes.

**Non-Specified Tribes:** This category includes respondents who checked the "American Indian or Alaska Native" response category on the Census questionnaire or wrote in the generic term "American Indian" or "Alaska Native," or tribal entries not elsewhere classified.

#### Why is it important?

Different groups of people may value and use public lands in different ways. Understanding the various values, beliefs, and attitudes of American Indian and Alaska Native tribes is an important consideration for public land managers where these populations reside and have a historical and/or current tie to the land. Some management actions may have disproportionately high and adverse effects on tribes and it is helpful to know if native peoples live in a particular geography.

#### Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

#### Additional Resources

The U.S. Forest Service Office of Tribal Relations, formed in 2004, is a useful source of information and policies related to agency-tribal relations. See: [fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml](https://fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml) <sup>(24)</sup>.

#### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

What occupations and industries are present?

This page describes what people do for work in terms of the type of work (occupation) and where they work (by industry).

Employment by Occupation, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Civilian employed population &gt; 16 years</b>	324,350	19,166	86,895	3,727	30,233	28,593	168,614	141,864,697
Management, professional, & related	129,476	7,856	40,246	1,305	10,411	11,485	71,303	51,341,226
Service	56,970	3,309	14,992	605	5,848	4,908	29,662	25,645,065
Sales and office	71,214	3,178	19,587	1,026	6,826	6,053	36,670	34,957,520
Farming, fishing, and forestry	4,188	618	409	33	292	460	1,812	1,030,881
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	28,890	2,013	5,276	333	2,806	2,651	13,079	11,832,435
Production, transportation, & material moving	33,612	2,192	6,385	425	4,050	3,036	16,088	17,057,570

Percent of Total

Management, professional, & related	39.9%	41.0%	46.3%	35.0%	34.4%	40.2%	42.3%	36.2%
Service	17.6%	17.3%	17.3%	16.2%	19.3%	17.2%	17.6%	18.1%
Sales and office	22.0%	16.6%	22.5%	27.5%	22.6%	21.2%	21.7%	24.6%
Farming, fishing, and forestry	1.3%	3.2%	0.5%	0.9%	1.0%	1.6%	1.1%	0.7%
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	8.9%	10.5%	6.1%	8.9%	9.3%	9.3%	7.8%	8.3%
Production, transportation, & material moving	10.4%	11.4%	7.3%	11.4%	13.4%	10.6%	9.5%	12.0%

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

Employment by Industry, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Civilian employed population &gt; 16 years</b>	324,350	19,166	86,895	3,727	30,233	28,593	168,614	141,864,697
Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, mining	8,543	1,381	850	54	619	860	3,764	2,731,302
Construction	23,940	1,636	4,231	404	2,308	2,201	10,780	8,864,481
Manufacturing	34,391	1,941	8,616	530	3,455	2,712	17,254	14,867,423
Wholesale trade	7,359	349	1,511	124	780	784	3,548	3,937,876
Retail trade	37,300	1,842	10,403	428	4,252	2,726	19,651	16,415,217
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	10,665	531	2,629	166	1,127	861	5,314	7,010,637
Information	6,839	361	2,047	66	610	660	3,744	3,056,318
Finance and insurance, and real estate	15,576	568	4,769	241	1,130	1,312	8,020	9,469,756
Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgmt.	28,375	1,538	9,574	355	2,237	2,630	16,334	15,300,528
Education, health care, & social assistance	90,880	6,064	25,650	810	8,119	8,638	49,281	32,871,216
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	30,060	1,442	8,926	243	3,051	2,958	16,620	13,262,892
Other services, except public administration	15,008	791	4,046	140	1,543	1,094	7,614	7,043,003
Public administration	15,414	722	3,643	166	1,002	1,157	6,690	7,034,048

Percent of Total

Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, mining	2.6%	7.2%	1.0%	1.4%	2.0%	3.0%	2.2%	1.9%
Construction	7.4%	8.5%	4.9%	10.8%	7.6%	7.7%	6.4%	6.2%
Manufacturing	10.6%	10.1%	9.9%	14.2%	11.4%	9.5%	10.2%	10.5%
Wholesale trade	2.3%	1.8%	1.7%	3.3%	2.6%	2.7%	2.1%	2.8%
Retail trade	11.5%	9.6%	12.0%	11.5%	14.1%	9.5%	11.7%	11.6%
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	3.3%	2.8%	3.0%	4.5%	3.7%	3.0%	3.2%	4.9%
Information	2.1%	1.9%	2.4%	1.8%	2.0%	2.3%	2.2%	2.2%
Finance and insurance, and real estate	4.8%	3.0%	5.5%	6.5%	3.7%	4.6%	4.8%	6.7%
Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgmt.	8.7%	8.0%	11.0%	9.5%	7.4%	9.2%	9.7%	10.8%
Education, health care, & social assistance	28.0%	31.6%	29.5%	21.7%	26.9%	30.2%	29.2%	23.2%
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	9.3%	7.5%	10.3%	6.5%	10.1%	10.3%	9.9%	9.3%
Other services, except public administration	4.6%	4.1%	4.7%	3.8%	5.1%	3.8%	4.5%	5.0%
Public administration	4.8%	3.8%	4.2%	4.5%	3.3%	4.0%	4.0%	5.0%

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Employment by Occupation, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Civilian employed population &gt; 16 years</b>	0%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Management, professional, & related	1%	3%	2%	6%	3%	2%	1%	0%
Service	1%	5%	3%	10%	4%	5%	2%	0%
Sales and office	1%	4%	3%	7%	4%	4%	2%	0%
Farming, fishing, and forestry	5%	13%	27%	48%	17%	18%	9%	1%
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	2%	5%	6%	13%	5%	7%	3%	0%
Production, transportation, & material moving	2%	5%	4%	13%	5%	6%	3%	0%

## Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation

Management, professional, & related	1%	3%	2%	6%	3%	2%	1%	0%
Service	1%	5%	3%	10%	4%	5%	2%	0%
Sales and office	1%	4%	3%	7%	4%	4%	2%	0%
Farming, fishing, and forestry	5%	13%	26%	48%	19%	19%	11%	0%
Construction, extraction, maint., & repair	2%	5%	6%	14%	5%	7%	3%	0%
Production, transportation, & material moving	2%	5%	4%	13%	5%	6%	3%	0%

## Employment by Industry, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Civilian employed population &gt; 16 years</b>	0%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, mining	4%	8%	16%	33%	11%	12%	6%	0%
Construction	2%	6%	6%	13%	6%	7%	3%	0%
Manufacturing	2%	5%	4%	10%	5%	7%	3%	0%
Wholesale trade	4%	13%	10%	26%	12%	14%	6%	0%
Retail trade	2%	6%	4%	11%	5%	6%	3%	0%
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	3%	10%	8%	18%	10%	12%	5%	0%
Information	4%	15%	8%	27%	14%	12%	6%	0%
Finance and insurance, and real estate	3%	10%	5%	20%	10%	11%	4%	0%
Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgmt.	2%	7%	3%	12%	7%	7%	2%	0%
Education, health care, & social assistance	1%	3%	2%	7%	3%	3%	1%	0%
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	2%	7%	4%	18%	5%	8%	3%	0%
Other services, except public administration	3%	10%	6%	18%	7%	11%	4%	0%
Public administration	3%	8%	7%	16%	9%	11%	4%	0%

## Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation

Agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, mining	5%	8%	19%	34%	12%	12%	5%	0%
Construction	2%	6%	6%	13%	6%	7%	3%	0%
Manufacturing	2%	5%	4%	10%	5%	6%	2%	0%
Wholesale trade	3%	13%	10%	26%	12%	13%	6%	0%
Retail trade	2%	6%	4%	11%	5%	6%	3%	0%
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	4%	11%	8%	18%	10%	12%	6%	0%
Information	3%	16%	8%	27%	15%	13%	5%	0%
Finance and insurance, and real estate	3%	10%	6%	20%	10%	11%	4%	0%
Prof., scientific, mgmt., admin., & waste mgmt.	2%	7%	3%	12%	7%	7%	3%	0%
Education, health care, & social assistance	1%	3%	2%	7%	3%	3%	1%	0%
Arts, entertain., rec., accomodation, & food	3%	7%	5%	18%	5%	8%	3%	0%
Other services, except public administration	3%	9%	7%	18%	7%	11%	4%	0%
Public administration	3%	8%	7%	16%	9%	12%	5%	0%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What occupations and industries are present?

### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes what people do for work in terms of the type of work (occupation) and where they work (by industry).

Employment by Occupation: Refers to the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system, where workers are classified into occupations with similar job duties, skills, education, and/or training, regardless of industry.

Employment by Industry: Refers to the employment by industry, listed according to the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS).

### Why is it Important?

Employment statistics are usually reported by industry (as with other reports in EPS-HDT). This is a useful way to show the relative diversity of the economy and the degree of dependence on certain sectors. Employment by occupation offers additional information that describes what people do for a living and the type of work they do, regardless of the industry. For example, management and professional occupations are generally of higher wage and require formal education, and these occupations could exist in any number of industries (for example, managers could be working for a software firm, a mine, or a construction company). Occupation information describes what people do, while employment by industry describes where people work.

### Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

### Additional Resources

The Census Bureau provides a definition of SOCS: [census.gov/hhes/www/iaindex/overview.html](https://www.census.gov/hhes/www/iaindex/overview.html) <sup>(25)</sup>.

Occupations are also defined by U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics: [bls.gov/soc/](https://www.bls.gov/soc/) <sup>(26)</sup>.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides an analysis of the prospects for different types of jobs, including training and education needed, earnings, working conditions, and what workers do on the job: [bls.gov/oco/](https://www.bls.gov/oco/) <sup>(27)</sup>.

### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

What are the characteristics of labor participation?

This page describes workers by weeks worked per year and usual hours works per week.

Labor Participation Characteristics, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Population 16 to 64</b>	420,406	25,129	112,068	4,756	40,480	36,340	218,773	204,340,912
<b>WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:</b>								
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	242,902	14,102	64,710	2,869	22,520	21,900	126,101	112,330,371
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	57,061	3,423	16,875	580	5,265	4,450	30,593	21,646,421
Worked 1 to 26 weeks	49,101	3,776	15,487	534	4,798	3,456	28,051	19,225,138
Did not work	71,342	3,828	14,996	773	7,897	6,534	34,028	51,138,982
<b>HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:</b>								
Worked 35 or more hours per week	253,109	14,689	67,078	3,001	23,866	22,607	131,241	116,424,223
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	71,784	4,530	21,539	827	6,744	5,538	39,178	29,453,219
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week	24,171	2,082	8,455	155	1,973	1,661	14,326	7,324,488
Did not work	71,342	3,828	14,996	773	7,897	6,534	34,028	51,138,982
Mean usual hours worked for workers	37.5	37.2	36.4	38.9	37.7	38.4	37.1	38.4


Percent of Total

<b>WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:</b>								
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	57.8%	56.1%	57.7%	60.3%	55.6%	60.3%	57.6%	55.0%
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	13.6%	13.6%	15.1%	12.2%	13.0%	12.2%	14.0%	10.6%
Worked 1 to 26 weeks	11.7%	15.0%	13.8%	11.2%	11.9%	9.5%	12.8%	9.4%
Did not work	17.0%	15.2%	13.4%	16.3%	19.5%	18.0%	15.6%	25.0%
<b>HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:</b>								
Worked 35 or more hours per week	60.2%	58.5%	59.9%	63.1%	59.0%	62.2%	60.0%	57.0%
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	17.1%	18.0%	19.2%	17.4%	16.7%	15.2%	17.9%	14.4%
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week	5.7%	8.3%	7.5%	3.3%	4.9%	4.6%	6.5%	3.6%
Did not work	17.0%	15.2%	13.4%	16.3%	19.5%	18.0%	15.6%	25.0%

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.


- In the 2009-2013 period, Grand Isle County, VT had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 50 to 52 weeks per year (60.3%), and the U.S. had the lowest (55.0%).

Weeks Worked per Year, 2013\*



- In the 2009-2013 period, Grand Isle County, VT had the highest estimated percent of people that worked 35 or more hours per week (63.1%), and the U.S. had the lowest (57.0%).

Hours Worked per Week, 2013\*



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Labor Participation Characteristics, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Population 16 to 64</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:</b>								
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%	1%	0%
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	1%	5%	3%	10%	4%	5%	2%	0%
Worked 1 to 26 weeks	2%	5%	3%	10%	5%	6%	2%	0%
Did not work	1%	4%	3%	8%	3%	4%	2%	0%
<b>HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:</b>								
Worked 35 or more hours per week	0%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	1%	3%	2%	7%	4%	4%	2%	0%
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week	2%	6%	4%	14%	7%	7%	3%	0%
Did not work	1%	4%	3%	8%	3%	4%	2%	0%
Mean usual hours worked for workers	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%

## Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation

<b>WEEKS WORKED PER YEAR:</b>								
Worked 50 to 52 weeks	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%	1%	0%
Worked 27 to 49 weeks	1%	4%	3%	10%	4%	5%	2%	0%
Worked 1 to 26 weeks	2%	5%	3%	10%	5%	6%	2%	0%
Did not work	1%	4%	3%	7%	3%	4%	2%	0%
<b>HOURS WORKED PER WEEK:</b>								
Worked 35 or more hours per week	0%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Worked 15 to 34 hours per week	1%	3%	3%	7%	4%	4%	2%	0%
Worked 1 to 14 hours per week	2%	6%	4%	15%	7%	8%	3%	0%
Did not work	1%	4%	3%	7%	3%	4%	2%	0%



## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What are the characteristics of labor participation?

### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes workers by hours worked per week and by weeks worked per year.

Note: Weeks worked per year and hours worked per week are irrespective of each other. For example, regardless of whether an individual worked 10 or 40 hours per week, if they worked 50 weeks per year, they will be recorded as having "worked 50 to 52 weeks per year".

### Why is it important?

Often, if too few hours are worked per week or weeks worked per year, the local economy may suffer from underemployment of labor and human capital, translating to lower real incomes and a lower standard of living. For example, labor incomes in agriculture and other seasonal sources of employment have consistently been among the lowest of the industrial classes as reported by the U.S. Census.

However, shorter work weeks and fewer weeks worked per year can be indicative of worker preference. Part-time jobs (those that average less than 35 hours/week) are often ideal for students, people who are responsible for taking care of their dependents, and the elderly who wish to remain active in the workplace but do not want to work a full schedule. Advances in computer technologies have also enabled workers to telecommute and work shorter and more flexible hours. And, in some cases, young adults seek out seasonal, tourism, or recreation related employment by choice. Since the 1960s, during periods of economic stability, the vast majority of part-time workers have been voluntary. For example, in 2006, only about one in seven part-time workers were involuntary (individuals wanting full-time jobs but working less than 35 hours/week).

To understand the degree to which the data on this page are related to underemployment and economic hardship versus worker preference, data on age and income distribution should be examined.

Most employment statistics count full time, part time, and seasonal employment as the same, a single job. In places where a relatively large percent of the employment base is either part time or seasonally employed this may explain falling wages or rates of employment that outpace population change (see the Socioeconomic Measures report for changes in wages, employment, and population over time).

### Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

### Additional Resources

Maynard, D. C. & Feldman, D. C. (Eds.) 2011. Underemployment: Psychological, economic and social challenges. New York: Springer.

A. Levenson. 2006. Trends in Jobs and Wages in the U.S. Economy. CEO Publication G 06-12 (501). Available at: [ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf](http://ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf) <sup>(26)</sup>.

For historical fluctuations of involuntary part-time employment, see: [bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf](http://bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf) <sup>(29)</sup>.

For information on unemployment, run the EPS-HDT Measures, Summary, or Tourism reports.

### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

What are commuting patterns?

This page describes workers who do not work from home by place of work and by travel time to work.

Commuting Characteristics, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Workers 16 years and over</b>	316,127	18,698	84,486	3,651	29,545	27,831	164,211	139,786,639
<b>PLACE OF WORK:</b>								
Worked in county of residence	244,571	12,910	77,532	1,098	25,466	16,924	133,930	101,321,530
Worked outside county of residence	71,556	5,788	6,954	2,553	4,079	10,907	30,281	38,465,109
<b>TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:</b>								
Less than 10 minutes	59,028	3,884	12,907	360	7,425	5,113	29,689	18,023,639
10 to 14 minutes	46,483	2,021	13,691	256	5,089	3,749	24,806	19,150,654
15 to 19 minutes	45,667	2,111	15,468	188	3,516	3,899	25,182	20,753,054
20 to 24 minutes	39,425	2,063	13,267	251	3,598	3,870	23,049	19,796,414
25 to 29 minutes	17,828	1,047	6,023	184	1,656	1,627	10,537	8,189,640
30 to 34 minutes	32,893	1,852	8,534	694	2,847	3,281	17,208	18,220,851
35 to 39 minutes	8,279	602	1,924	245	649	767	4,187	3,673,571
40 to 44 minutes	9,726	767	1,920	382	624	776	4,469	4,920,004
45 to 59 minutes	18,992	1,586	3,113	489	1,034	1,808	8,030	10,154,523
60 or more minutes	15,488	1,077	1,984	334	1,426	1,066	5,887	10,857,904
Mean travel time to work (minutes)	22	24	20	33	20	22	21	26


Percent of Total

<b>PLACE OF WORK:</b>								
Worked in county of residence	77.4%	69.0%	91.8%	30.1%	86.2%	60.8%	81.6%	72.5%
Worked outside county of residence	22.6%	31.0%	8.2%	69.9%	13.8%	39.2%	18.4%	27.5%
<b>TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:</b>								
Less than 10 minutes	18.7%	20.8%	15.3%	9.9%	25.1%	18.4%	18.1%	12.9%
10 to 14 minutes	14.7%	10.8%	16.2%	7.0%	17.2%	13.5%	15.1%	13.7%
15 to 19 minutes	14.4%	11.3%	18.3%	5.1%	11.9%	14.0%	15.3%	14.8%
20 to 24 minutes	12.5%	11.0%	15.7%	6.9%	12.2%	13.9%	14.0%	14.2%
25 to 29 minutes	5.6%	5.6%	7.1%	5.0%	5.6%	5.8%	6.4%	5.9%
30 to 34 minutes	10.4%	9.9%	10.1%	19.0%	9.6%	11.8%	10.5%	13.0%
35 to 39 minutes	2.6%	3.2%	2.3%	6.7%	2.2%	2.8%	2.5%	2.6%
40 to 44 minutes	3.1%	4.1%	2.3%	10.5%	2.1%	2.8%	2.7%	3.5%
45 to 59 minutes	6.0%	8.5%	3.7%	13.4%	3.5%	6.5%	4.9%	7.3%
60 or more minutes	4.9%	5.8%	2.3%	9.1%	4.8%	3.8%	3.6%	7.8%

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

Place of Work, 2013\*

- In the 2009-2013 period, Grand Isle County, VT had the highest estimated percent of people that worked outside the county of residence (69.9%), and Chittenden County, VT had the lowest (8.2%).



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

**Commuting Characteristics, Coefficients of Variation**

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Workers 16 years and over</b>	0%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%
PLACE OF WORK:								
Worked in county of residence	0%	2%	1%	7%	1%	2%	1%	0%
Worked outside county of residence	1%	4%	5%	4%	4%	3%	2%	0%
TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:								
Less than 10 minutes	2%	5%	4%	12%	4%	6%	2%	0%
10 to 14 minutes	2%	6%	3%	15%	5%	5%	2%	0%
15 to 19 minutes	1%	6%	3%	18%	5%	5%	2%	0%
20 to 24 minutes	1%	6%	3%	16%	4%	5%	2%	0%
25 to 29 minutes	2%	9%	5%	18%	8%	9%	4%	0%
30 to 34 minutes	2%	6%	4%	9%	6%	7%	3%	0%
35 to 39 minutes	4%	12%	8%	17%	14%	15%	5%	0%
40 to 44 minutes	3%	9%	8%	15%	11%	14%	5%	0%
45 to 59 minutes	2%	7%	6%	11%	9%	9%	4%	0%
60 or more minutes	2%	8%	9%	13%	8%	11%	4%	0%
Mean travel time to work (minutes)	1%	3%	2%	4%	3%	2%	1%	0%

**Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation**

PLACE OF WORK:								
Worked in county of residence	0%	2%	1%	7%	1%	2%	1%	0%
Worked outside county of residence	1%	4%	4%	4%	4%	3%	2%	0%
TRAVEL TIME TO WORK:								
Less than 10 minutes	2%	5%	4%	12%	4%	6%	2%	0%
10 to 14 minutes	2%	6%	3%	16%	5%	5%	2%	0%
15 to 19 minutes	1%	5%	3%	18%	6%	5%	2%	0%
20 to 24 minutes	1%	6%	3%	16%	4%	5%	2%	0%
25 to 29 minutes	2%	9%	5%	18%	8%	8%	4%	0%
30 to 34 minutes	2%	6%	4%	9%	6%	7%	3%	0%
35 to 39 minutes	5%	11%	8%	17%	14%	15%	5%	0%
40 to 44 minutes	4%	9%	8%	15%	12%	13%	4%	0%
45 to 59 minutes	2%	7%	7%	10%	9%	9%	4%	0%
60 or more minutes	2%	7%	8%	13%	9%	11%	5%	0%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What are commuting patterns?

### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes workers who do not work from home by place of work and by travel time to work.

Place of Work: The values reported under "place of work" describe the number of workers that live in the selected geographic area who worked either in or outside the county they live in. If the selected geography is not a county, the workers may or may not work within the selected geography. For example, for the city of Phoenix, the data reported for "Worked in county of residence" describes the number of city of Phoenix residents that worked in Maricopa County (but not necessarily within the city of Phoenix).

### Why is it important?

High rates of out-commuting are more common in non-metro areas, and in parts of the U.S. where communities are closer together.

Economic development is sometimes affected by commuting in unanticipated ways: strategies aimed at increasing jobs in a community will not necessarily mean jobs for residents. Conversely, creating job opportunities for residents does not always require bringing jobs into that community.

High out-commuting rates can also separate tax revenues from demands for services, complicating fiscal planning for local governments. "Bedroom communities," those with high levels of out-commuting, may struggle to provide social services, housing, and water and sewer facilities without an adequate source of revenue. Higher levels and longer distance of commuting likely indicate a housing-job imbalance. This can result from unaffordable housing prices or other residential constraints.

### Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

### Additional Resources

Aldrich, L., Beale, B. and K. Kasse. 1997. Commuting and the Economic Functions of Small Towns and Places. Rural Development Perspectives 12(3). [ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf](https://ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf) <sup>(30)</sup>.

### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

How is income distributed?

This page describes the distribution of household income.

Household Income Distribution, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
Per Capita Income (2013 \$s)	\$29,167	\$28,722	\$33,281	\$33,159	\$26,205	\$30,932	na	\$28,155
Median Household Income^ (2013 \$s)	\$54,267	\$57,565	\$63,989	\$59,509	\$49,271	\$52,460	na	\$53,046
<b>Total Households</b>	257,004	14,164	62,587	3,023	25,754	25,024	130,552	115,610,216
Less than \$10,000	15,122	728	3,520	85	1,674	1,400	7,407	8,380,364
\$10,000 to \$14,999	14,349	674	3,207	99	1,488	1,517	6,985	6,214,548
\$15,000 to \$24,999	26,875	1,524	5,080	281	3,195	2,662	12,742	12,468,604
\$25,000 to \$34,999	25,846	1,131	5,153	280	2,761	2,600	11,925	11,929,761
\$35,000 to \$49,999	36,490	2,033	7,730	473	3,985	3,597	17,818	15,723,148
\$50,000 to \$74,999	50,853	2,952	11,165	665	5,104	4,725	24,611	20,744,045
\$75,000 to \$99,999	35,306	2,231	9,388	380	3,488	3,378	18,865	14,107,031
\$100,000 to \$149,999	32,198	1,856	10,078	401	2,667	3,161	18,163	14,858,239
\$150,000 to \$199,999	11,164	567	3,820	181	880	1,117	6,565	5,651,848
\$200,000 or more	8,801	468	3,446	178	512	867	5,471	5,532,628
<b>Gini Coefficient^</b>	0.44	0.43	0.44	0.42	0.42	0.44	na	0.47

Percent of Total


Less than \$10,000	5.9%	5.1%	5.6%	2.8%	6.5%	5.6%	5.7%	7.2%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	5.6%	4.8%	5.1%	3.3%	5.8%	6.1%	5.4%	5.4%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	10.5%	10.8%	8.1%	9.3%	12.4%	10.6%	9.8%	10.8%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	10.1%	8.0%	8.2%	9.3%	10.7%	10.4%	9.1%	10.3%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	14.2%	14.4%	12.4%	15.6%	15.5%	14.4%	13.6%	13.6%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	19.8%	20.8%	17.8%	22.0%	19.8%	18.9%	18.9%	17.9%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	13.7%	15.8%	15.0%	12.6%	13.5%	13.5%	14.5%	12.2%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	12.5%	13.1%	16.1%	13.3%	10.4%	12.6%	13.9%	12.9%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	4.3%	4.0%	6.1%	6.0%	3.4%	4.5%	5.0%	4.9%
\$200,000 or more	3.4%	3.3%	5.5%	5.9%	2.0%	3.5%	4.2%	4.8%

^ Median Household Income and Gini Coefficient are not available for metro/non-metro or regional aggregations.


\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

- In the 2009-2013 period, the income category in the County Region with the most households was \$50,000 to \$74,999 (18.9% of households). The income category with the fewest households was \$200,000 or more (4.2% of households).
- In the 2009-2013 period, the bottom 40% of households in the County Region accumulated approximately 13.2% of total income, and the top 20% of households accumulated approximately 52.7% of total income.
- In the 2009-2013 period, Grand Isle County, VT had the most equal income distribution between high and low income households (Gini coef. of 0.42) and the U.S. had the least equal income distribution (Gini coef. of 0.47).

Household Income Distribution, County Region, 2013\*



Lorenz Curve, County Region, 2013\*



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Household Income Distribution, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
Per-Capita Income	1%	3%	1%	3%	1%	2%	na	0%
Median Household Income^ (2013) \$s	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%	3%	na	0%
<b>Total Households</b>	0%	1%	0%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Less than \$10,000	3%	13%	6%	25%	6%	9%	4%	0%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	3%	12%	6%	21%	8%	8%	4%	0%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	2%	8%	5%	14%	6%	7%	3%	0%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	2%	8%	6%	14%	5%	7%	3%	0%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	2%	5%	4%	10%	5%	6%	3%	0%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	1%	5%	3%	11%	5%	5%	2%	0%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	2%	5%	4%	10%	4%	5%	2%	0%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	2%	6%	3%	10%	6%	6%	2%	0%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	3%	9%	5%	15%	11%	10%	4%	0%
\$200,000 or more	3%	13%	6%	17%	13%	9%	4%	0%
<b>Gini Coefficient</b>	1%	3%	1%	3%	1%	2%	na	0%
<b>Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation</b>								
Less than \$10,000	3%	13%	6%	26%	7%	9%	4%	0%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	2%	11%	6%	22%	7%	8%	5%	0%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	2%	8%	5%	14%	6%	7%	3%	0%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	2%	8%	6%	14%	6%	8%	3%	0%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	2%	5%	4%	10%	6%	5%	3%	0%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	2%	5%	3%	11%	5%	5%	2%	0%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	2%	5%	4%	10%	4%	5%	3%	0%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	1%	6%	3%	10%	5%	6%	2%	0%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	3%	9%	5%	15%	11%	10%	4%	0%
\$200,000 or more	4%	13%	6%	18%	12%	9%	4%	0%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### How is income distributed?

#### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes the distribution of household income.

**Per Capita Income:** Total personal income divided by total population of an area.

**Household:** A household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence.

**Gini Coefficient:** provides a summary value of the inequality of income distribution. A value of 0 represents perfect equality and a value of 1 represents perfect inequality. The lower the Gini coefficient, the more equal the income distribution.

**Lorenz Curve:** a graphic representation comparing income distribution in the geography selected to the hypothetical lines of perfect equality and perfect inequality. Every point on the Lorenz curve can be used to develop statements such as "the bottom \_\_\_% of households have \_\_\_% of all income," or "the top \_\_\_% of households have \_\_\_% of all income."

#### Why is it important?

For public land managers, one of the important considerations of proposed management actions is whether low income populations could experience disproportionately high and adverse effects of proposed management actions. Understanding income differences within and between geographies helps to highlight areas where the population or a sub-population may be experiencing economic hardship.

The distribution of income can help to highlight several important aspects of economic well-being. A large number of households in the lower end of income distribution indicates economic hardship. A bulge in the middle distribution can be interpreted as the size of the middle class. A figure that shows a proportionally large number of households at both extremes indicates a geography characterized by "haves" and "have-nots."

Income distribution has always been a central concern of economic theory and economic policy. Classical economists were mainly concerned with the distribution of income between the main factors of production, land, labor, and capital. Modern economists have also addressed this issue, but have been more concerned with the distribution of income across individuals and households.

According to the Census Bureau, "Researchers believe that changes in the labor market and... household composition affected the long-run increase in income inequality. The wage distribution has become considerably more unequal with workers at the top experiencing real wage gains and those at the bottom real wage losses... At the same time, long-run changes in society's living arrangements have taken place also tending to exacerbate household income differences. For example, divorces, marital separations, births out of wedlock, and the increasing age at first marriage have led to a shift away from married-couple households to single-parent families and nonfamily households. Since non-married-couple households tend to have lower income and less equally distributed income than other types of households... changes in household composition have been associated with growing income inequality."

#### Methods

While the Census Bureau does not have an official definition of the "middle class," it does derive several measures related to the distribution of income and income inequality. Two standard measures of income equality are the Lorenz Curve and the Gini Coefficient. Mean values for each cohort were used to calculate total income, in the case of the top income cohort, income was assumed to be \$250,000, a value which tends to yield lower than actual values for income disparity. For details on how to calculate, see Additional Resources below.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

#### Additional Resources

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service published a useful article on metro and non-metro income levels and inequality. McLaughlin, Diane K. "Income Inequality in America." 2002. Rural America. Vol. 17(2). It is available at: [ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf](http://ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf) <sup>(31)</sup>.

For useful remarks and scholarly references on the level and distribution of economic well-being, see Federal Reserve System Chairman Ben S. Bernanke's speech on February 6, 2007, available at: [federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm](http://federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm) <sup>(32)</sup>.

For a helpful definition and description of the Lorenz Curve and Gini Coefficient see: [econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator](http://econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator) <sup>(33)</sup>.

For source material on how the Gini Coefficient and Lorenz Curve were computed see: <https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzahxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZzY&hl=en> <sup>(34)</sup>.

#### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.  
Study Guide

What are poverty levels?

This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the poverty line.

**Poverty:** Following the Office of Management and Budget's Directive 14, the Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to detect who is poor. If the total income for a family or an unrelated individual falls below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being "below the poverty level."

Poverty, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
People	601,245	34,217	148,314	6,979	58,981	55,366	303,857	303,692,076
Families	161,275	9,530	37,546	2,142	16,215	15,483	80,916	76,744,358
People Below Poverty	70,873	3,875	16,672	481	7,655	5,708	34,391	46,663,433
Families below poverty	12,205	803	2,309	114	1,349	983	5,558	8,666,630


Percent of Total

People Below Poverty	11.8%	11.3%	11.2%	6.9%	13.0%	10.3%	11.3%	15.4%
Families below poverty	7.6%	8.4%	6.1%	5.3%	8.3%	6.3%	6.9%	11.3%

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

- In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of individuals living below poverty (15.4%), and Grand Isle County, VT had the lowest (6.9%).
- In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of families living below poverty (11.3%), and Grand Isle County, VT had the lowest (5.3%).

Individuals and Families Below Poverty, 2013\*



Percent Below Poverty Level by Age & Family Type~, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>People</b>	11.8%	11.3%	11.2%	6.9%	13.0%	10.3%	11.3%	15.4%
Under 18 years	14.8%	16.1%	11.1%	10.3%	16.8%	12.8%	13.0%	21.6%
65 years and older	7.5%	7.0%	6.5%	2.3%	8.3%	7.5%	7.1%	9.4%
<b>Families</b>	7.6%	8.4%	6.1%	5.3%	8.3%	6.3%	6.9%	11.3%
Families with related children < 18 years	13.4%	14.8%	10.5%	10.5%	15.0%	13.3%	12.3%	17.8%
Married couple families	3.2%	3.2%	2.1%	2.0%	4.1%	2.3%	2.7%	5.6%
with children < 18 years	4.5%	4.1%	2.8%	2.8%	5.9%	3.1%	3.5%	8.3%
Female householder, no husband present	28.5%	33.1%	26.4%	14.7%	28.1%	27.2%	27.5%	30.6%
with children < 18 years	37.4%	41.1%	37.0%	18.9%	36.4%	36.9%	37.0%	40.0%

-Percent below poverty level by age and family type is calculated by dividing the number of people by demographic in poverty by the total population of that demographic.

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.



## Poverty, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
People	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Families	1%	2%	1%	3%	1%	2%	1%	0%
Individuals Below Poverty	2%	6%	4%	19%	6%	6%	3%	0%
Families Below Poverty	3%	10%	9%	26%	9%	11%	5%	0%

### Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation

Individuals Below Poverty	2%	6%	4%	19%	6%	6%	3%	0%
Families Below Poverty	3%	10%	9%	25%	9%	11%	5%	0%

### Percent Below Poverty Level by Age and Family Type, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>People</b>	2%	6%	4%	19%	6%	6%	3%	0%
Under 18 years	3%	9%	7%	27%	9%	11%	4%	0%
65 years and older	4%	14%	12%	35%	10%	12%	6%	0%
<b>Families</b>	3%	10%	9%	26%	9%	11%	5%	0%
Families with related children < 18 years	4%	12%	10%	29%	12%	15%	6%	0%
Married couple families	6%	19%	17%	40%	15%	18%	9%	0%
with children < 18 years	7%	24%	20%	61%	22%	24%	12%	1%
Female householder, no husband present	5%	16%	13%	51%	16%	18%	8%	0%
with children < 18 years	6%	17%	14%	55%	17%	20%	8%	0%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are poverty levels?

#### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes the number of individuals and families living below the poverty line.

**Family:** A group of two or more people who reside together and who are related by birth, marriage, or adoption.

**Poverty:** Following the Office of Management and Budget's Directive 14, the Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to detect who is poor. If the total income for a family or an unrelated individual falls below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being "below the poverty level."

#### Why is it important?

Poverty is an important indicator of economic well-being. For public land managers, understanding the extent of poverty is important for several reasons. First, people with limited income may have different needs, values, and attitudes as they relate to public lands. Second, proposed activities on public lands may need to be analyzed in the context of whether people who are economically disadvantaged could experience disproportionately high and adverse effects.

Poverty rates are often reported in aggregate, which can hide important differences. The bottom table shows poverty for various types of individuals and families. This is important because aggregate poverty rates (for example, families below poverty) may hide some important information (for example, the poverty rate for single mothers with children).

#### Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

#### Additional Resources

For more information on rural poverty, see U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Briefing Room, "Rural Income, Poverty, and Welfare: High Poverty Counties" available at: [ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx](https://ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx) <sup>(35)</sup>.

The University of Michigan's National Poverty Center has a range of resources on poverty in the United States. See: [www.npc.umich.edu/poverty](http://www.npc.umich.edu/poverty) <sup>(36)</sup>.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as "the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies." Environmental Protection Agency environmental justice resources are available at: [epa.gov/compliance/ej](https://epa.gov/compliance/ej) <sup>(4)</sup>.

#### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

What are poverty levels?

This page describes the number of people living in poverty by race and ethnicity. It also shows the share of all people living in poverty by race and ethnicity, and the share of each race and ethnicity living in poverty.

**Race:** Race is a self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identify.

**Ethnicity:** There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal government considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race.

Poverty by Race and Ethnicity<sup>A</sup>, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Population (all races) in Poverty</b>	70,873	3,875	16,672	481	7,655	5,708	34,391	46,663,433
White alone	65,165	3,577	13,735	460	7,404	5,373	30,549	28,254,647
Black or African American alone	1,415	144	905	0	31	82	1,162	10,165,935
American Indian alone	509	32	180	6	73	50	341	701,439
Asian alone	1,277	29	817	0	51	93	990	1,872,394
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99,943
Some other race	233	9	117	0	0	11	137	3,872,191
Two or more races	2,274	84	918	15	96	99	1,212	1,696,884
<b>All Ethnicities in Poverty</b>								
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	1,383	82	456	11	28	157	734	12,507,866
Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	69,490	3,793	16,216	470	7,627	5,551	33,657	34,155,567

Percent of Total (Total = All individuals in poverty)

White alone	91.9%	92.3%	82.4%	95.6%	96.7%	94.1%	88.8%	60.5%
Black or African American alone	2.0%	3.7%	5.4%	0.0%	0.4%	1.4%	3.4%	21.8%
American Indian alone	0.7%	0.8%	1.1%	1.2%	1.0%	0.9%	1.0%	1.5%
Asian alone	1.8%	0.7%	4.9%	0.0%	0.7%	1.6%	2.9%	4.0%
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Some other race	0.3%	0.2%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.4%	8.3%
Two or more races	3.2%	2.2%	5.5%	3.1%	1.3%	1.7%	3.5%	3.6%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	2.0%	2.1%	2.7%	2.3%	0.4%	2.8%	2.1%	26.8%
Not Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	98.0%	97.9%	97.3%	97.7%	99.6%	97.2%	97.9%	73.2%

<sup>A</sup> Percent of total population in poverty by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the number of people in poverty in each racial or ethnic category by the total population.

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

Percent of People by Race and Ethnicity Who Are Below Poverty~, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
White alone	11.4%	10.8%	10.0%	6.9%	12.9%	10.1%	10.6%	12.5%
Black or African American alone	26.1%	55.0%	31.3%	0.0%	14.9%	29.9%	31.8%	27.1%
American Indian alone	28.9%	34.4%	42.4%	12.2%	56.2%	44.6%	42.2%	28.6%
Asian alone	17.4%	8.0%	19.4%	0.0%	14.5%	20.0%	18.3%	12.5%
Native Hawaiian & Oceanic alone	0.0%	0.0%	na	na	na	na	0.0%	19.6%
Some other race alone	14.3%	42.9%	18.6%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	12.7%	26.8%
Two or more races alone	19.8%	19.4%	28.1%	6.4%	12.6%	10.0%	21.3%	20.1%
Hispanic or Latino alone	15.3%	15.0%	16.5%	11.8%	4.1%	21.7%	15.3%	24.7%
Non-Hispanic/Latino alone	11.3%	10.8%	9.9%	6.8%	13.0%	10.0%	10.6%	10.6%

~Poverty prevalence by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the number of people by race in poverty by the total population of that race.

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

### Poverty by Race and Ethnicity, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Population (all races)</b>	2%	6%	4%	19%	6%	6%	3%	0%
White alone	2%	6%	4%	20%	6%	6%	3%	0%
Black or African American alone	17%	22%	26%	na	57%	39%	20%	0%
American Indian alone	19%	44%	28%	101%	45%	66%	20%	1%
Asian alone	14%	59%	19%	na	55%	42%	16%	1%
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	2%
Some other race	27%	81%	43%	na	na	72%	39%	1%
Two or more races	10%	31%	18%	65%	29%	32%	14%	0%
<b>All Ethnicities</b>								
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	12%	29%	21%	83%	56%	56%	18%	0%
Not Hispanic/Latino	2%	6%	4%	20%	6%	7%	3%	1%

### Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation

White alone	2%	6%	4%	20%	6%	6%	3%	0%
Black or African American alone	18%	21%	26%	na	60%	38%	20%	0%
American Indian alone	17%	44%	28%	102%	45%	62%	18%	0%
Asian alone	13%	57%	19%	na	55%	41%	17%	0%
Native Hawaiian & Oth.Pacific Is. alone	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	0%
Some other race	18%	79%	43%	na	na	63%	46%	1%
Two or more races	9%	31%	18%	64%	29%	32%	14%	0%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not Hispanic/Latino	0%	1%	1%	2%	0%	2%	0%	0%

### Percent Below Poverty Level by Race and Ethnicity, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
White alone	2%	7%	4%	20%	6%	7%	3%	0%
Black or African American alone	17%	26%	26%	na	60%	42%	21%	0%
American Indian alone	21%	48%	33%	111%	53%	76%	24%	1%
Asian alone	22%	94%	24%	na	112%	86%	23%	1%
Native Hawaiian & Oceanic alone	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	18%
Some other race alone	30%	100%	50%	na	na	79%	43%	1%
Two or more races alone	10%	32%	19%	66%	30%	34%	15%	1%
Hispanic or Latino alone	12%	30%	21%	83%	57%	56%	18%	0%
Non-Hispanic/Latino alone	2%	7%	4%	20%	6%	7%	3%	1%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are poverty levels?

#### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes the number of people living in poverty by race and ethnicity. It also shows the share of all people living in poverty by race and ethnicity, and the share of each race and ethnicity living in poverty.

**Race:** Race is a self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identify.

**Ethnicity:** There are two minimum categories for ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino. The federal government considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race.

**Poverty:** Following the Office of Management and Budget's Directive 14, the Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to detect who is poor. If the total income for a family or an unrelated individual falls below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being "below the poverty level."

#### Why is it important?

For public land managers, understanding whether different races and ethnicities are affected by poverty can be important. People with limited income and from different races and ethnicities may have different needs, values, and attitudes as they relate to public lands. In addition, proposed activities on public lands may need to be analyzed in the context of whether minorities and people who are economically disadvantaged could experience disproportionately high and adverse effects.

#### Methods

The Census Bureau uses the federal government's official poverty definition. According to the Census: "Families and persons are classified as below poverty if their total family income or unrelated individual income was less than the poverty threshold specified for the applicable family size, age of householder, and number of related children under 18 present" (see below for poverty level thresholds).

The poverty thresholds are updated every year by the Census Bureau to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index. The poverty thresholds are the same for all parts of the country. They are not adjusted for regional, state or local variations in the cost of living. The specific thresholds used for tabulation of income for particular years are shown at: [census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html](https://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html) <sup>(37)</sup>.

Race categories include both racial and national-origin groups. The concept of race is separate from the concept of Hispanic origin. Percentages for the various race categories add to 100 percent, and should not be combined with the percent Hispanic.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

#### Additional Resources

The University of Michigan's National Poverty Center hosts a body of research on race and ethnicity as they relate to poverty. See: [npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity](https://npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity) <sup>(38)</sup>.

The U.S. Census Bureau briefing on "Poverty Areas" shows that Blacks and Hispanics are disproportionately affected by poverty. "Four times as many Blacks and three times as many Hispanics lived in poverty areas than lived outside them." For more information, see: [census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html](https://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html) <sup>(39)</sup>.

#### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

What are the components of household earnings?

This page describes household earnings by income source and mean household earnings by source.

Number of Households Receiving Earnings, by Source, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
Total households:	257,004	14,164	62,587	3,023	25,754	25,024	130,552	115,610,216
Labor earnings	204,178	11,534	52,138	2,458	19,683	19,268	105,081	90,436,935
Social Security (SS)	80,465	4,413	15,825	976	8,946	8,620	38,780	33,386,448
Retirement income	43,303	2,440	10,036	645	4,839	4,514	22,474	20,504,523
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	13,709	641	2,816	138	1,660	1,469	6,724	5,716,592
Cash public assistance income	11,311	524	2,805	135	1,653	901	6,018	3,255,213
Food Stamp/SNAP	34,437	1,831	6,684	401	4,161	3,330	16,407	14,339,330

Percent of Total<sup>^</sup>


Labor earnings	79.4%	81.4%	83.3%	81.3%	76.4%	77.0%	80.5%	78.2%
Social Security (SS)	31.3%	31.2%	25.3%	32.3%	34.7%	34.4%	29.7%	28.9%
Retirement income	16.8%	17.2%	16.0%	21.3%	18.8%	18.0%	17.2%	17.7%
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	5.3%	4.5%	4.5%	4.6%	6.4%	5.9%	5.2%	4.9%
Cash public assistance income	4.4%	3.7%	4.5%	4.5%	6.4%	3.6%	4.6%	2.8%
Food Stamp/SNAP	13.4%	12.9%	10.7%	13.3%	16.2%	13.3%	12.6%	12.4%

<sup>^</sup> Total may add to more than 100% due to households receiving more than 1 source of income.

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

Percent of Households Receiving Earnings, by Source, 2013\*

- In the 2009-2013 period, the highest estimated percent of public assistance in the County Region was in the form of Social Security (SS) (29.7%), and the lowest was in the form of Cash public assistance income (4.6%).



Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source, 2013 (2013 \$s)

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
Mean earnings	\$68,644	\$67,245	\$80,585	\$76,522	\$60,325	\$68,553	\$73,025	\$75,017
Mean Social Security income	\$17,081	\$17,393	\$17,676	\$17,611	\$16,830	\$17,646	\$17,440	\$17,189
Mean retirement income	\$20,691	\$20,047	\$22,726	\$22,686	\$20,812	\$21,105	\$21,696	\$23,589
Mean Supplemental Security Income	\$9,217	\$8,041	\$9,042	\$8,732	\$9,153	\$8,847	\$8,925	\$9,152
Mean cash public assistance income	\$3,410	\$5,042	\$3,405	\$3,313	\$3,269	\$3,170	\$3,473	\$3,808

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

### Number of Households Receiving Earnings, By Source, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
Total households:	0%	1%	0%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Labor earnings	0%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Social Security (SS)	1%	2%	2%	5%	2%	2%	1%	0%
Retirement income	1%	4%	3%	7%	3%	4%	2%	0%
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	3%	12%	8%	18%	8%	9%	5%	0%
Cash public assistance income	4%	12%	7%	24%	8%	12%	5%	0%
Food Stamp/SNAP	2%	6%	5%	13%	6%	6%	3%	0%

### Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation

Labor earnings	0%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Social Security (SS)	1%	3%	2%	5%	2%	2%	1%	0%
Retirement income	1%	4%	3%	7%	4%	4%	2%	0%
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	3%	12%	8%	19%	8%	9%	5%	0%
Cash public assistance income	4%	12%	7%	25%	9%	12%	5%	0%
Food Stamp/SNAP	2%	6%	5%	13%	6%	6%	3%	0%

### Mean Annual Household Earnings by Source, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
Mean earnings	1%	2%	1%	4%	2%	2%	1%	0%
Mean Social Security income	1%	3%	3%	7%	3%	3%	1%	0%
Mean retirement income	2%	8%	5%	12%	7%	7%	3%	0%
Mean Supplemental Security Income	4%	17%	13%	26%	12%	14%	7%	0%
Mean cash public assistance income	6%	24%	14%	40%	15%	21%	8%	0%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are the components of household earnings?

#### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes household earnings by source.

Labor Earnings: Refers to households that receive wage or salary income and net income from self-employment.

Social Security: Refers to households that receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor benefits, permanent disability insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance. It does not include Medicare reimbursement.

Retirement income: Consists of families that receive income from: (1) retirement pensions and survivor benefits from a former employer; labor union; or federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. military; (2) disability income from companies or unions; federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. military; (3) periodic receipts from annuities and insurance; and (4) regular income from IRA and Keogh plans. It does not include Social Security income.

Supplemental Security Income (SSI): Refers to households that receive assistance by the Social Security Administration that guarantees a minimum level of income for needy aged, blind, or disabled individuals.

Cash Public Assistance Income: Are households that receive public assistance that includes general assistance and Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). It does not include separate payments received for hospital or other medical care (vendor payments) or Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or noncash benefits such as Food Stamps.

Food Stamps/SNAP: Refers to households that receive coupons or cards that can be used to purchase food. This program was recently renamed the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). ACS does not report mean dollar amounts for this item.

#### Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

#### Why is this important?

Earnings are not the only source of income, and for many families and communities a significant portion of income can be in the form of additional sources, such as retirement and Social Security. While some payments may be an indication of an aging population or an influx of retirees (retirement payments), other measures (for example, SSI or Food Stamps) are an indication of economic hardship.

#### Additional Resources

For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see:  
[census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\\_documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf](https://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data_documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf) (40).

#### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.



What are education and enrollment levels?

This page describes educational attainment and school enrollment.

Educational Attainment, 2013\*


	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Population 25 yrs or older</b>	433,401	24,793	102,086	5,172	43,572	41,811	217,434	206,587,852
No high school degree	37,321	2,294	6,266	437	4,615	3,072	16,684	28,887,721
High school graduate	396,080	22,499	95,820	4,735	38,957	38,739	200,750	177,700,131
Associates degree	36,977	1,710	9,388	517	3,494	3,447	18,556	16,135,795
Bachelor's degree or higher	150,866	8,823	48,338	1,567	12,183	14,216	85,127	59,583,138
Bachelor's degree	91,084	4,937	30,118	978	7,646	7,738	51,417	37,286,246
Graduate or professional	59,782	3,886	18,220	589	4,537	6,478	33,710	22,296,892

Percent of Total

No high school degree	8.6%	9.3%	6.1%	8.4%	10.6%	7.3%	7.7%	14.0%
High school graduate	91.4%	90.7%	93.9%	91.6%	89.4%	92.7%	92.3%	86.0%
Associates degree	8.5%	6.9%	9.2%	10.0%	8.0%	8.2%	8.5%	7.8%
Bachelor's degree or higher	34.8%	35.6%	47.4%	30.3%	28.0%	34.0%	39.2%	28.8%
Bachelor's degree	21.0%	19.9%	29.5%	18.9%	17.5%	18.5%	23.6%	18.0%
Graduate or professional	13.8%	15.7%	17.8%	11.4%	10.4%	15.5%	15.5%	10.8%

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

- In the 2009-2013 period, Chittenden County, VT had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with a bachelor's degree or higher (47.4%), and Rutland County, VT had the lowest (28.0%).
- In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people over the age of 25 with no high school degree (14.0%), and Chittenden County, VT had the lowest (6.1%).



School Enrollment, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Population over 3 years old:</b>	608,105	35,864	153,316	6,852	59,781	54,828	310,641	299,795,523
Enrolled in school:	153,287	9,880	46,360	1,530	14,252	11,906	83,928	82,624,806
Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	8,718	492	2,510	144	998	770	4,914	5,011,192
Enrolled in kindergarten	6,716	407	1,806	86	459	596	3,354	4,208,394
Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	27,746	1,591	6,621	303	2,571	2,549	13,635	16,286,543
Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	28,883	1,702	6,814	320	2,888	2,425	14,149	16,510,313
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12	32,146	1,990	7,618	344	2,980	2,905	15,837	17,153,559
Enrolled in college, undergraduate years	40,815	3,363	17,960	245	3,745	1,516	26,829	19,333,036
Graduate or professional school	8,263	335	3,031	88	611	1,145	5,210	4,121,769
Not enrolled in school	454,818	25,984	106,956	5,322	45,529	42,922	226,713	217,170,717

Percent of Total

Enrolled in school:	25.2%	27.5%	30.2%	22.3%	23.8%	21.7%	27.0%	27.6%
Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	1.4%	1.4%	1.6%	2.1%	1.7%	1.4%	1.6%	1.7%
Enrolled in kindergarten	1.1%	1.1%	1.2%	1.3%	0.8%	1.1%	1.1%	1.4%
Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	4.6%	4.4%	4.3%	4.4%	4.3%	4.6%	4.4%	5.4%
Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	4.7%	4.7%	4.4%	4.7%	4.8%	4.4%	4.6%	5.5%
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12	5.3%	5.5%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.3%	5.1%	5.7%
Enrolled in college, undergraduate years	6.7%	9.4%	11.7%	3.6%	6.3%	2.8%	8.6%	6.4%
Graduate or professional school	1.4%	0.9%	2.0%	1.3%	1.0%	2.1%	1.7%	1.4%
Not enrolled in school	74.8%	72.5%	69.8%	77.7%	76.2%	78.3%	73.0%	72.4%

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

### Educational Attainment, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Population 25 yrs or older</b>	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
No high school degree	2%	6%	5%	13%	5%	6%	3%	0%
High school graduate	0%	2%	1%	3%	1%	2%	1%	0%
Associates degree	2%	6%	4%	10%	5%	5%	3%	0%
Bachelor's degree or higher	1%	3%	2%	5%	3%	3%	1%	0%
Bachelor's degree	1%	3%	2%	7%	3%	4%	1%	0%
Graduate or professional	1%	4%	3%	8%	4%	4%	2%	0%

### Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation

No high school degree	2%	7%	5%	13%	5%	6%	2%	0%
High school graduate	0%	2%	1%	3%	1%	2%	1%	0%
Associates degree	1%	5%	4%	10%	5%	5%	3%	0%
Bachelor's degree or higher	1%	3%	2%	5%	3%	3%	1%	0%
Bachelor's degree	1%	3%	2%	6%	3%	4%	1%	0%
Graduate or professional	1%	4%	2%	8%	5%	4%	2%	0%

### School Enrollment, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Population over 3 years old:</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Enrolled in school:	0%	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%	1%	0%
Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	3%	9%	6%	18%	12%	14%	5%	0%
Enrolled in kindergarten	4%	11%	8%	19%	14%	14%	5%	0%
Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	2%	5%	3%	9%	6%	6%	2%	0%
Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	2%	4%	4%	11%	5%	6%	2%	0%
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12	1%	3%	3%	8%	4%	3%	2%	0%
Enrolled in college, undergraduate years	1%	4%	2%	13%	6%	9%	2%	0%
Graduate or professional school	4%	16%	7%	19%	13%	16%	6%	0%
Not enrolled in school	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%

### Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation

Enrolled in school:	0%	2%	1%	4%	2%	2%	1%	0%
Enrolled in nursery school, preschool	4%	9%	7%	17%	11%	13%	4%	0%
Enrolled in kindergarten	6%	11%	10%	19%	16%	11%	6%	0%
Enrolled in grade 1 to grade 4	1%	5%	3%	8%	6%	7%	3%	0%
Enrolled in grade 5 to grade 8	1%	4%	4%	10%	5%	5%	3%	0%
Enrolled in grade 9 to grade 12	1%	3%	2%	7%	4%	3%	1%	0%
Enrolled in college, undergraduate years	1%	4%	2%	14%	6%	9%	2%	0%
Graduate or professional school	4%	13%	6%	19%	12%	15%	7%	0%
Not enrolled in school	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What are education and enrollment levels?

### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes levels of educational attainment.

Educational Attainment: This refers to the level of education completed by people 25 years and over in terms of the highest degree or the highest level of schooling completed.

School Enrollment: The ACS defines people as enrolled in school if when the survey was conducted they were attending a public or private school or college at any time during the three months prior to the time of interview. People enrolled in vocational, technical, or business school such as post secondary vocational, trade, hospital school, and on job training were not reported as enrolled in school.

### Why is it important?

Education is one of the most important indicators of the potential for economic success, and lack of education is closely linked to poverty. Studies show that geographies with a higher than average educated workforce grow faster, have higher incomes, and suffer less during economic downturns than other geographies. See "Additional Resources" below for more information.

For public land managers, understanding the differences in education levels can highlight whether certain people in geographic areas might experience disproportionately high and adverse effects of particular management actions. It also can help to identify how communication and outreach efforts could be tailored to different audiences.

School enrollment is an important indicator of the number of dependents in a community that are not of working age, access to education, and potential for future growth. Some government agencies also use this information for funding allocations.

### Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

### Additional Resources

For information on the relationship between level of education, earnings, year-round employment, and unemployment rates, see:

The Bureau of Labor Statistics' web resource: [bls.gov/emp/ep\\_chart\\_001.htm](http://bls.gov/emp/ep_chart_001.htm) (41).

U.S. Census Bureau's 2002 publication "The Big Payoff: Educational Attainment and Synthetic Estimates of Work-Life Earnings," available at: [census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf](http://census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf) (42).

Card, David (1999). "The Causal Effect of Education on Earnings" in Orley Ashenfelter and David Card, eds., *Handbook of Labor Economics*, vol. 3A. New York: Elsevier, pp. 1801-63.

### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

What languages are spoken?

This page measures the primary language people speak at home.

Language Spoken at Home: The language currently used by respondents five years and over at home, either "English only" or a non-English language which is used in addition to English or in place of English.

Language Spoken at Home, 2013\*


	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
Population 5 yrs or older	594,667	35,185	149,900	6,677	58,550	53,748	304,060	291,484,482
Speak only English	563,632	33,375	137,350	6,447	56,146	51,579	284,897	231,122,908
Speak a language other than English	31,035	1,810	12,550	230	2,404	2,169	19,163	60,361,574
Spanish or Spanish Creole	6,179	526	1,743	19	691	649	3,628	37,458,624
Other Indo-European languages	18,349	891	6,859	189	1,275	1,169	10,383	10,737,607
Asian and Pacific Island languages	4,808	334	2,754	14	320	283	3,705	9,539,099
Other languages	1,699	59	1,194	8	118	68	1,447	2,626,244
Speak English less than "very well"	8,754	456	4,677	34	576	457	6,200	25,148,900

Percent of Total

Speak only English	94.8%	94.9%	91.6%	96.6%	95.9%	96.0%	93.7%	79.3%
Speak a language other than English	5.2%	5.1%	8.4%	3.4%	4.1%	4.0%	6.3%	20.7%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	1.0%	1.5%	1.2%	0.3%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	12.9%
Other Indo-European languages	3.1%	2.5%	4.6%	2.8%	2.2%	2.2%	3.4%	3.7%
Asian and Pacific Island languages	0.8%	0.9%	1.8%	0.2%	0.5%	0.5%	1.2%	3.3%
Other languages	0.3%	0.2%	0.8%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.5%	0.9%
Speak English less than "very well"	1.5%	1.3%	3.1%	0.5%	1.0%	0.9%	2.0%	8.6%

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

Percent of Population that Speaks English Less Than "Very Well", 2013\*



- In the 2009-2013 period, the U.S. had the highest estimated percent of people that spoke English less than 'very well' (8.6%), and Grand Isle County, VT had the lowest (0.5%).

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Language Spoken at Home, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
Population 5 yrs or older	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Speak only English	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Speak a language other than English	3%	7%	5%	23%	8%	10%	4%	0%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	5%	10%	9%	35%	16%	16%	6%	0%
Other Indo-European languages	4%	12%	7%	22%	13%	15%	5%	0%
Asian and Pacific Island languages	8%	17%	12%	165%	22%	23%	9%	0%
Other languages	17%	55%	22%	266%	58%	132%	20%	1%
Speak English less than "very well"	5%	19%	9%	141%	18%	29%	7%	0%

## Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation

Speak only English	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Speak a language other than English	2%	7%	5%	23%	9%	9%	4%	0%
Spanish or Spanish Creole	6%	8%	10%	43%	15%	15%	5%	0%
Other Indo-European languages	4%	12%	7%	21%	14%	14%	5%	0%
Asian and Pacific Island languages	8%	19%	13%	174%	22%	23%	10%	0%
Other languages	21%	73%	23%	254%	60%	144%	26%	0%
Speak English less than "very well"	4%	19%	8%	143%	19%	29%	6%	0%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

What languages are spoken?

### What do we measure on this page?

This page measures the primary language people speak at home.

Language Spoken at Home: The language currently used by respondents five years and over at home, either "English only" or a non-English language which is used in addition to English or in place of English.

### Why is it important?

For public land managers who are trying to communicate with citizens of communities adjacent to public lands, it is important to know whether a significant portion of that population has trouble speaking English. If this is the case, public outreach, meetings, plans, and implementation may need to be conducted in multiple languages.

### Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

### Additional Resources

The Modern Language Association has developed an online mapping tool that shows languages spoken for most geographies in the United States. This tool is available at: [mla.org/map\\_single](http://mla.org/map_single)<sup>(43)</sup>.

### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

What are the main housing characteristics?

This page describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year built.

Housing Characteristics, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Housing Units</b>	322,915	16,767	66,002	5,073	33,725	34,077	155,644	132,057,804
Occupied	257,004	14,164	62,587	3,023	25,754	25,024	130,552	115,610,216
Vacant	65,911	2,603	3,415	2,050	7,971	9,053	25,092	16,447,588
For rent	4,449	212	619	55	1,076	632	2,594	3,230,123
Rented, not occupied	1,054	23	115	26	211	65	440	599,884
For sale only	3,326	315	388	120	383	509	1,715	1,682,020
Sold, not occupied	658	0	18	0	23	140	181	608,590
For seasonal, recreational, occasional use	48,401	1,683	1,373	1,705	5,548	6,759	17,068	5,122,778
For migrant workers	119	0	0	0	17	19	36	34,233
Other vacant	7,904	370	902	144	713	929	3,058	5,169,960
<b>Year Built</b>								
Built 2005 or later	1,255	48	393	16	95	75	627	771,765
Built 2000 to 2004	32,399	1,797	7,408	798	2,155	3,280	15,438	19,385,497
Built 1990 to 1999	37,046	2,191	8,723	663	3,027	3,700	18,304	18,390,124
Built 1980 to 1989	52,602	2,426	11,487	844	5,291	5,611	25,659	18,345,244
Built 1970 to 1979	51,207	2,621	10,188	716	5,640	5,670	24,835	21,042,566
Built 1960 to 1969	28,754	1,506	6,579	531	3,584	2,668	14,868	14,634,125
Built 1959 or earlier	119,652	6,178	21,224	1,505	13,933	13,073	55,913	39,488,483
<b>Median year structure built<sup>^</sup></b>	1973	1973	1975	1977	1968	1972	na	1976


Percent of Total

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Occupancy</b>								
Occupied	79.6%	84.5%	94.8%	59.6%	76.4%	73.4%	83.9%	87.5%
Vacant	20.4%	15.5%	5.2%	40.4%	23.6%	26.6%	16.1%	12.5%
For rent	1.4%	1.3%	0.9%	1.1%	3.2%	1.9%	1.7%	2.4%
Rented, not occupied	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.5%	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%
For sale only	1.0%	1.9%	0.6%	2.4%	1.1%	1.5%	1.1%	1.3%
Sold, not occupied	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.5%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	15.0%	10.0%	2.1%	33.6%	16.5%	19.8%	11.0%	3.9%
For migrant workers	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Other vacant	2.4%	2.2%	1.4%	2.8%	2.1%	2.7%	2.0%	3.9%
<b>Year Built</b>								
Built 2005 or later	0.4%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.6%
Built 2000 to 2004	10.0%	10.7%	11.2%	15.7%	6.4%	9.6%	9.9%	14.7%
Built 1990 to 1999	11.5%	13.1%	13.2%	13.1%	9.0%	10.9%	11.8%	13.9%
Built 1980 to 1989	16.3%	14.5%	17.4%	16.6%	15.7%	16.5%	16.5%	13.9%
Built 1970 to 1979	15.9%	15.6%	15.4%	14.1%	16.7%	16.6%	16.0%	15.9%
Built 1960 to 1969	8.9%	9.0%	10.0%	10.5%	10.6%	7.8%	9.6%	11.1%
Built 1959 or earlier	37.1%	36.8%	32.2%	29.7%	41.3%	38.4%	35.9%	29.9%

<sup>^</sup> Median year structure built is not available for metro/non-metro or regional aggregations.

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

- In the 2009-2013 period, Grand Isle County, VT had the highest estimated percent of the vacant housing (40.4%), and Chittenden County, VT had the lowest (5.2%).



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Housing Characteristics, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Total Housing Units</b>	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Occupied	0%	1%	0%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Vacant	1%	5%	8%	4%	3%	3%	2%	1%
For rent	6%	25%	23%	48%	12%	18%	9%	1%
Rented, not occupied	15%	58%	44%	65%	28%	38%	19%	1%
For sale only	8%	24%	26%	28%	20%	15%	10%	1%
Sold, not occupied	18%	na	101%	na	50%	36%	31%	1%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	1%	4%	12%	4%	3%	3%	2%	0%
For migrant workers	42%	na	na	na	72%	70%	74%	2%
Other vacant	5%	15%	18%	22%	16%	14%	8%	1%
<b>Year Built</b>								
Built 2005 or later	11%	33%	25%	49%	29%	45%	17%	0%
Built 2000 to 2004	2%	6%	4%	9%	7%	5%	2%	0%
Built 1990 to 1999	2%	5%	3%	11%	6%	5%	2%	0%
Built 1980 to 1989	1%	6%	3%	9%	4%	5%	2%	0%
Built 1970 to 1979	1%	5%	4%	10%	3%	3%	2%	0%
Built 1960 to 1969	2%	7%	4%	10%	5%	6%	3%	0%
Built 1959 or earlier	1%	3%	2%	6%	3%	3%	1%	0%
<b>Median year structure built</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	na	0%

## Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Occupancy</b>								
Occupied	0%	1%	0%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Vacant	1%	5%	8%	4%	3%	3%	2%	1%
For rent	4%	24%	19%	45%	11%	20%	7%	0%
Rented, not occupied	19%	44%	35%	71%	29%	32%	22%	0%
For sale only	6%	23%	21%	28%	21%	16%	11%	0%
Sold, not occupied	30%	na	0%	na	89%	30%	52%	0%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	1%	4%	12%	4%	3%	3%	2%	0%
For migrant workers	0%	na	na	na	121%	109%	0%	0%
Other vacant	5%	14%	18%	21%	17%	13%	9%	2%
<b>Year Built</b>								
Built 2005 or later	16%	42%	20%	58%	22%	55%	15%	0%
Built 2000 to 2004	2%	6%	4%	9%	7%	5%	2%	0%
Built 1990 to 1999	2%	5%	3%	11%	6%	5%	2%	0%
Built 1980 to 1989	1%	5%	3%	9%	4%	5%	2%	0%
Built 1970 to 1979	1%	5%	4%	10%	3%	3%	2%	0%
Built 1960 to 1969	2%	7%	4%	10%	5%	6%	3%	0%
Built 1959 or earlier	1%	3%	2%	6%	3%	3%	1%	0%



## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### What are the main housing characteristics?

#### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes whether housing is occupied or vacant, for rent or seasonally occupied, and the year built.

Rent: The number of homes for rent was defined as occupied housing units that were for rent, vacant housing units that were for rent, and vacant units rented but not occupied at the time of interview.

For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use: Refers to vacant units used or intended for use only in certain seasons or for weekends or other occasional use throughout the year.

For Migrant Workers: refers to housing units intended for occupancy by migratory workers employed in farm work during the crop season.

#### Why is it important?

Vacancy status is an indicator of the housing market and provides information on the stability and quality of housing for certain areas. The data is used to assess the demand for housing, to identify housing turnover within areas, and to better understand the population within the housing market over time. These data also serve to aid in the development of housing programs to meet the needs of persons at different economic levels.

Seasonal or recreational homes (i.e., "second homes") are often an indicator of the desirability of a place for recreation and tourism. This could also be used as an indicator of recreational and scenic amenities, which can be one of the economic contributions of public lands.

While the late 1990s and early 2000s were a period of rapid home development throughout the country, there have been other periods when housing grew at a fast rate (the late 1970s, for example, in some parts of the country). Understanding the relative growth rates of housing is relevant for public lands managers in the context of the wildland-urban interface, and as an indicator of overall economic growth. The year the home was built also provides information on the age of the housing stock, which can be used to forecast future demand of services, such as energy consumption and fire protection.

Housing that is classified as available for migrant workers can be used as an indicator of a certain type of economic activity, in particular crop agriculture.

#### Methods

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

#### Additional Resources

For a glossary of terms used in ACS, see:

[census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\\_documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf](https://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data_documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf) <sup>(40)</sup>.

#### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

How affordable is housing?

This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.

Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, 2013\*

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Owner-occupied housing units with a mortgage</b>	120,485	6,970	29,517	1,666	11,194	11,136	60,483	49,820,840
Monthly cost <15% of household income	17,598	882	4,595	254	1,658	1,478	8,867	9,215,740
Monthly cost >30% of household income	44,405	2,602	9,806	738	4,245	4,427	21,818	17,636,343
<b>Specified renter-occupied units</b>	74,467	3,667	21,851	568	7,812	7,562	41,460	40,534,516
Gross rent <15% of household income	6,186	405	1,495	32	767	828	3,527	4,355,942
Gross rent >30% of household income	36,059	1,619	11,687	242	3,728	3,274	20,550	19,581,493
<b>Median monthly mortgage cost<sup>^</sup></b>	\$1,546	\$1,559	\$1,832	\$1,712	\$1,431	\$1,557	na	\$1,540
<b>Median gross rent<sup>^</sup></b>	\$875	\$877	\$1,026	\$871	\$789	\$852	na	\$904

Percent of Total

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
Monthly cost <15% of household income	14.6%	12.7%	15.6%	15.2%	14.8%	13.3%	14.7%	18.5%
Monthly cost >30% of household income	36.9%	37.3%	33.2%	44.3%	37.9%	39.8%	36.1%	35.4%
Gross rent <15% of household income	8.3%	11.0%	6.8%	5.6%	9.8%	10.9%	8.5%	10.7%
Gross rent >30% of household income	48.4%	44.2%	53.5%	42.6%	47.7%	43.3%	49.6%	48.3%

<sup>^</sup> Median monthly mortgage cost and median gross rent are not available for metro/non-metro or regional aggregations.

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.


- In the 2009-2013 period, Grand Isle County, VT had the highest estimated percent of owner-occupied households where greater than 30% of household income was spent on mortgage costs (44.3%), and Chittenden County, VT had the lowest (33.2%).

- In the 2009-2013 period, Chittenden County, VT had the highest estimated percent of renter-occupied households where greater than 30% of household income was spent on gross rent (53.5%), and Grand Isle County, VT had the lowest (42.6%).


- In the 2009-2013 period, Chittenden County, VT had the highest estimated monthly mortgage costs for owner-occupied homes (\$1,832), and Rutland County, VT had the lowest (\$1,431).

- In the 2009-2013 period, Chittenden County, VT had the highest estimated monthly gross rent for renter-occupied homes (\$1,026), and Rutland County, VT had the lowest (\$789).

Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, 2013\*



Median Monthly Mortgage Costs and Gross Rent, 2013\*



Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Housing Costs as a Percent of Household Income, Coefficients of Variation

	Vermont	Addison County, VT	Chittenden County, VT	Grand Isle County, VT	Rutland County, VT	Windsor County, VT	County Region	U.S.
<b>Owner-occupied housing units with a mortgage</b>	0.7%	2.0%	1.4%	4.6%	2.1%	2.3%	0.9%	0.3%
Monthly cost <15% of household income	2.4%	8.2%	5.4%	15.3%	7.1%	8.2%	3.5%	0.3%
Monthly cost >30% of household income	1.5%	4.8%	3.7%	7.9%	4.7%	4.9%	2.2%	0.1%
<b>Specified renter-occupied units</b>	0.9%	3.7%	1.6%	9.6%	3.9%	3.6%	1.3%	0.2%
Gross rent <15% of household income	5.1%	14.0%	11.6%	49.4%	14.3%	13.4%	6.8%	0.3%
Gross rent >30% of household income	1.9%	7.9%	3.7%	16.1%	6.0%	6.9%	2.7%	0.1%
<b>Median monthly mortgage cost<sup>A</sup></b>	0.5%	1.5%	0.9%	3.1%	1.6%	1.9%	na	0.0%
<b>Median gross rent<sup>A</sup></b>	0.6%	2.6%	1.4%	7.2%	1.8%	2.4%	na	0.1%
<b>Percent of Total, Coefficients of Variation</b>								
Monthly cost <15% of household income	2.5%	8.2%	5.5%	15.2%	7.0%	8.2%	3.3%	0.3%
Monthly cost >30% of household income	1.5%	4.7%	3.7%	8.0%	4.6%	4.9%	2.2%	0.2%
Gross rent <15% of household income	5.1%	13.8%	11.6%	49.6%	14.2%	13.3%	7.1%	0.6%
Gross rent >30% of household income	1.9%	7.8%	3.6%	16.1%	6.0%	6.9%	2.7%	0.1%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

### How affordable is housing?

#### What do we measure on this page?

This page describes whether housing is affordable for homeowners and renters.

Owner-Occupied Housing Unit: A housing unit is owner-occupied if the owner or co-owner lives in the unit even if it is mortgaged or not fully paid for.

Renter-Occupied Housing Unit: All occupied units which are not owner-occupied, whether they are rented for cash rent or occupied without payment of cash rent, are classified as renter-occupied.

Household: A household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence.

Monthly Costs (owner-occupied): The sum of payment for mortgages, real estate taxes, various insurances, utilities, fuels, mobile home costs, and condominium fees.

Gross Rent: The amount of the contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities (electricity, gas, and water and sewer) and fuels (oil, coal, kerosene, wood, etc.) if these are paid for by the renter (or paid for the renter by someone else).

#### Why is it important?

An important indicator of economic hardship is whether housing is affordable. This page measures housing affordability in terms of the share of household income that is devoted to mortgage and related costs (for homeowners) and rent and related costs (for renters). The income share devoted to housing that is below 15 percent is a good proxy for highly affordable, while the income share devoted to housing that is above 30 percent is a good proxy for unaffordable.

#### Methods

The lowest ownership costs and gross rent share of household income reported in ACS is 15 percent. Many government agencies define as excessive (or unaffordable) housing costs that exceed 30 percent of monthly household income.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

#### Additional Resources

The U.S. Census Bureau's American Housing Survey has additional information on housing and housing affordability. See: [census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html](https://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html) <sup>(44)</sup>.

For housing prices, for-profit online real-estate services may have the most recent price information. See, for example, [zillow.com](https://www.zillow.com) <sup>(45)</sup>.

For current calculations on housing affordability, see the National Association of Realtors' Housing Affordability Index, available at: [realtor.org/research/research/housinginx](https://www.nar.realtor.org/research/research/housinginx) <sup>(46)</sup>.

#### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.?

This page compares key demographic, income, and social indicators from the region to the United States.

Indicators	County Region	U.S.	County Region vs. U.S.
<b>Demographics</b>	Population Growth (% change, 2000-2013*)	2.9%	10.7%
	Median Age (2013*)	na	37.3
	Percent Population White Alone (2013*)	94.3%	74.0%
	Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2013*)	1.7%	16.6%
	Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native (2013*)	0.3%	0.8%
	Percent of Population 'Baby Boomers' (2013*)	34.6%	30.6%
	<b>Income</b>	Median Household Income (2013*)	na
Per Capita Income (2013*)		na	\$28,155
Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2013*)		11.3%	15.4%
Percent Families Below Poverty (2013*)		6.9%	11.3%
Percent of Households with Retirement and Social Security Income (2013*)		46.9%	46.6%
Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income (2013*)		22.3%	20.2%
<b>Structure</b>	Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High School Degree (2013*)	7.7%	14.0%
	Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's Degree or Higher (2013*)	39.2%	28.8%
	Percent Population That Speak English Less Than 'Very Well' (2013*)	2.0%	8.6%
	Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2013*)	11.0%	3.9%
	Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of Household Income Spent on Mortgage (2013*)	36.1%	35.4%
	Renter-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of Household Income Spent on Gross Rent (2013*)	49.6%	48.3%

\* The data in this table are calculated by ACS using annual surveys conducted during 2009-2013 and are representative of average characteristics during this period.

- The County Region is most different from the U.S. in Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2013\*), Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2013\*), and Percent Population That Speak English Less Than 'Very Well' (2013\*).

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Indicators

	Region	US
Population Growth (% change, 2000-2009*)	0.0%	0.0%
Median Age (2009*)	na	0.2%
Percent Population White Alone (2009*)	0.1%	0.0%
Percent Population Hispanic or Latino (2009*)	0.0%	0.0%
Percent Population American Indian or Alaska Native	23.3%	0.0%
Percent of Population "Baby	0.5%	0.0%
Median Family Income (2009*)	na	0.1%
Per Capita Income (2009*)	na	0.2%
Percent Individuals Below Poverty (2009*)	2.7%	0.4%
Percent Families Below Poverty (2009*)	5.3%	0.0%
Percent of Households with Retirement and Social	1.0%	0.1%
Percent of Households with Public Assistance Income	2.2%	0.3%
Percent Population 25 Years or Older without High	2.4%	0.0%
Percent Population 25 Years or Older with Bachelor's	1.1%	0.2%
Percent Population That Speak English Less Than	6.0%	0.0%
Percent of Houses that are Seasonal Homes (2009*)	1.7%	0.0%
Owner-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of	2.2%	0.2%
Renter-Occupied Homes where Greater than 30% of	2.7%	0.1%

## Study Guide and Supplemental Information

How do demographic, income, and social characteristics in the region compare to the U.S.?

### What do we measure on this page?

This page compares key demographic, income, and social indicators from the region to the United States.

The term "benchmark" in this report should not be construed as having the same meaning as in the National Forest Management Act.

Race: Race is a self-identification data item in which Census respondents choose the race or races with which they most closely identify. The Office of Management and Budget revised the standards in 1997 for how the Federal government collects and presents data on race and ethnicity.

Poverty: Following the Office of Management and Budget's Directive 14, the Census Bureau uses a set of income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to detect who is poor. If the total income for a family or an unrelated individual falls below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or an unrelated individual is classified as being "below the poverty level."

Baby Boomers: Baby boomers are defined as having been born between 1946-1964. The reported percent of population that are "baby boomers" has some associated error since ACS generally reports age classes in 5-year increments (55 to 59 years, 60 to 64 years, etc.).

Social Security: Refers to households who receive income that includes Social Security pensions and survivor benefits, permanent disability insurance payments made by the Social Security Administration before deductions for medical insurance, and railroad retirement insurance. It does not include Medicare reimbursement.

Retirement Income: Consists of families that receive income from: (1) retirement pensions and survivor benefits from a former employer; labor union; or federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. military; (2) disability income from companies or unions; federal, state, or local government; and the U.S. military; (3) periodic receipts from annuities and insurance; and (4) regular income from IRA and Keogh plans. It does not include Social Security income.

### Why is it important?

This page shows a quick comparison of a number of indicators covered in this report to highlight where the region is different from the U.S.

It also offers an at-a-glance view of whether groups of indicators are atypical compared to the U.S. For example, this page may show that a geography has an older population, relatively unaffordable housing, and difficulties communicating in English. In combination, these indicators can help public land managers identify groups of people and aspects of hardship that can aid with outreach and consideration of whether the impacts of land management actions could have disproportionately high and adverse impacts on disadvantaged people or places.

### Methods

The ratio of the selected region to the U.S. is a percentage calculated by dividing the figure from the region by the figure from the U.S.

Data accuracy is indicated as follows: **BLACK** indicates a coefficient of variation < 12%; **ORANGE** (preceded with one dot) indicates between 12 and 40%; and **RED BOLD** (preceded with two dots) indicates a coefficient of variation > 40%. If data have consistently low accuracy throughout a report, we suggest running another demographics report at a larger geographic scale.

Median Age, Median Household Income and Per Capita Income are not calculated for multi-geography regions due to data availability.

### Data Sources

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2013. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Office, Washington, D.C.

## Data Sources

EPS-HDT uses published statistics from government sources that are available to the public and cover the entire country. All data used in EPS-HDT can be readily verified by going to the original source. The contact information for databases used in this profile is:

- **2000 Decennial U.S. Census**

Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce.  
<http://www.census.gov>  
Tel. 303-969-7750

- **American Community Survey**

Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce.  
<http://www.census.gov>  
Tel. 303-969-7750  
The on-line ACS data retrieval tool is available at:  
<http://www.census.gov/acs/www/>

## Methods

### EPS-HDT core approaches

EPS-HDT is designed to focus on long-term trends across a range of important measures. Trend analysis provides a more comprehensive view of changes than spot data for select years. We encourage users to focus on major trends rather than absolute numbers.

EPS-HDT displays detailed industry-level data to show changes in the composition of the economy over time and the mix of industries at points in time.

EPS-HDT employs cross-sectional benchmarking, comparing smaller geographies such as counties to larger regions, states, and the nation, to give a sense of relative performance.

EPS-HDT allows users to aggregate data for multiple geographies, such as multi-Regions, to accommodate a flexible range of user-defined areas of interest and to allow for more sophisticated cross-sectional comparisons.

### About the American Community Survey (ACS)

With the exception of some 2000 Decennial Census data used on pages 1-3, all other data used in this report is based on the American Community Survey (ACS) of the Census Bureau.

The ACS is a nation-wide survey conducted every year by the Census Bureau that provides current demographic, social, economic, and housing information about communities every year—information that until recently was only available once a decade. The ACS is not the same as the decennial census, which is conducted every ten years (the ACS has replaced the detailed, Census 2000 long-form questionnaire).

Data used in this report are 5-year ACS estimates. More so than the 1 or 3-year estimates, the 5-year estimates are consistently available for small geographies, such as towns. We show 5-year estimates for all geographies since data obtained using the same survey technique is ideal for cross-geography comparisons. The disadvantage is that multiyear estimates cannot be used to describe any particular year in the period, only what the average value is over the full period.



## Links to Additional Resources

For more information about EPS-HDT see:

[headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt](http://headwaterseconomics.org/eps-hdt)

Web pages listed under Additional Resources include:

Throughout this report, references to on-line resources are indicated by superscripts in parentheses. These resources are provided as hyperlinks here.

- 1 [www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej\\_guidance\\_nepa\\_ceq1297.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/resources/policy/ej_guidance_nepa_ceq1297.pdf)
- 2 [www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology\\_main/](http://www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/methodology_main/)
- 3 [www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\\_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf](http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data_documentation/Accuracy/MultiyearACSAccuracyofData2009.pdf)
- 4 [www.epa.gov/compliance/ej](http://www.epa.gov/compliance/ej)
- 5 [www.stateoftheusa.org](http://www.stateoftheusa.org)
- 6 [www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx](http://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration.aspx)
- 7 [www.frey-demographer.org](http://www.frey-demographer.org)
- 8 [www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging\\_statistics/index.aspx](http://www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging_statistics/index.aspx)
- 9 [www.census.gov/popest/](http://www.census.gov/popest/)
- 10 [www.countyhealthrankings.org/](http://www.countyhealthrankings.org/)
- 11 [www.prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx](http://www.prb.org/Journalists/Webcasts/2009/distilleddemographics1.aspx)
- 12 [www.census.gov/population/age/](http://www.census.gov/population/age/)
- 13 [www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/p25-1138.pdf)
- 14 [www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx](http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err79.aspx)
- 15 [www.census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html](http://www.census.gov/population/www/projections/projectionsagesex.html)
- 16 [www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg\\_1997standards](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg_1997standards)
- 17 [www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf)
- 18 <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>
- 19 [www.measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart](http://www.measureofamerica.org/acenturyapart)
- 20 [www.census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22\\_cspan\\_hispanics.pdf](http://www.census.gov/newsroom/cspan/hispanic/2012.06.22_cspan_hispanics.pdf)
- 21 [www.icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard\\_10pg.pdf](http://www.icbemp.gov/science/hansisrichard_10pg.pdf)
- 22 [www.bia.gov/index.htm](http://www.bia.gov/index.htm)
- 23 [www.indians.org/index.html](http://www.indians.org/index.html)
- 24 [www.fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml](http://www.fs.fed.us/spf/tribalrelations/index.shtml)
- 25 [www.census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/overview.html](http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/ioindex/overview.html)
- 26 [www.bls.gov/soc/](http://www.bls.gov/soc/)
- 27 [www.bls.gov/oco/](http://www.bls.gov/oco/)
- 28 [www.ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf](http://www.ceo.usc.edu/pdf/G0612501.pdf)
- 29 [www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf](http://www.bls.gov/opub/ils/pdf/opbils71.pdf)
- 30 [www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf](http://www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/RDP/RDP697/RDP697e.pdf)
- 31 [www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf](http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ruralamerica/ra172/ra172c.pdf)
- 32 [www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm](http://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/Bernanke20070206a.htm)
- 33 [www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator](http://www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=885&type=educator)
- 34 <https://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AXe2E1Mm09WIZGhzazhxaDRfMjUzZ25nMjdkZy&hl=en>
- 35 [www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx](http://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being.aspx)
- 36 [www.npc.umich.edu/poverty](http://www.npc.umich.edu/poverty)
- 37 [www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html](http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index.html)
- 38 [www.npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity](http://www.npc.umich.edu/research/ethnicity)
- 39 [www.census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html](http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/statbriefs/povarea.html)
- 40 [www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data\\_documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009\\_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf](http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data_documentation/SubjectDefinitions/2009_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf)
- 41 [www.bls.gov/emp/ep\\_chart\\_001.htm](http://www.bls.gov/emp/ep_chart_001.htm)
- 42 [www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-210.pdf)
- 43 [www.mla.org/map\\_single](http://www.mla.org/map_single)
- 44 [www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html](http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/ahs/ahs.html)
- 45 [www.zillow.com](http://www.zillow.com)
- 46 [www.realtor.org/research/research/housinginx](http://www.realtor.org/research/research/housinginx)

## **APPENDIX K AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS BACKGROUND**

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

**Table K-1. Estimated Equipment and Vehicle Use during Aquatic Cable Installation, Lake Champlain Segment**

Activity	Equipment and Vehicles			Hours per Day	Working Days <sup>1</sup>	LF	Trips	Cables	Total Hours
	Type	BHP	Qty						
Cable Installation	Primary Cable Vessel								
	2 Azimuth Units	2640	2	24	66	0.25	1	2	1584
	Azimuth Unit	1360	1	24	66	0.25	1	2	792
	Retractable Azimuth Unit	2475	1	24	66	0.1	1	2	317
	Tunnel Unit	1300	1	24	66	0.25	1	2	792
	Generators (500 kVA)	536	4	24	66	0.75	1	2	9504
	Generators (600 kVA)	643	1	24	66	0.5	1	2	1584
	Survey Boat	1131	1	24	66	0.5	1	2	1584
	Crew Boat	425	1	24	66	0.2	1	2	634
Installation of Cable Protection	Tugboat, Towboat	1970	1	12	66	0.25	1	2	396
	Crew Boat	425	1	12	66	0.2	1	2	317
Cable Shipments <sup>2</sup>	Main Propulsion	8201	1	10		0.5	19		95
	Auxiliary Engine	1776	1	10		0.17	19		32

Notes:

BHP Brake-horsepower. The maximum rated load of the vehicle or vessel engine(s).

LF Load Factor

<sup>1</sup> 66 work-days based on 1 to 3 miles per day from MP 0 to MP 98.<sup>2</sup> Cable shipments emission duration of 10 hours per trip based on 12 mph for 120 miles.<sup>3</sup> 120 miles is the average distance for each of the 19 cable shipments (6 miles of cable per shipment) round trip.

**Table K-2. Emission Factors,<sup>1</sup> Lake Champlain Segment**

Activity	Equipment and Vehicles			VOC lb/hr	CO lb/hr	NO <sub>x</sub> lb/hr	SO <sub>x</sub> lb/hr	PM <sub>10</sub> lb/hr	PM <sub>2.5</sub> lb/hr	CO <sub>2</sub> lb/hr	CH <sub>4</sub> lb/hr <sup>2</sup>	N <sub>2</sub> O lb/hr <sup>2</sup>
	Type	Category	BHP									
Cable Installation	2 Azimuth Units	Marine	2640	2.07	10.48	29.64	0.03	1.41	1.37	3118.31	0.12	0.02
	Azimuth Unit	Marine	1360	1.06	5.40	15.27	0.01	0.73	0.70	1606.40	0.06	0.01
	Retractable Azimuth Unit	Marine	2475	1.94	9.82	27.79	0.03	1.32	1.28	2923.41	0.11	0.02
	Tunnel Unit	Marine	1300	1.02	5.16	14.60	0.01	0.69	0.67	1535.53	0.06	0.01
	Generators (500 kVA)	Marine	536	0.33	1.47	5.46	0.01	0.23	0.23	626.53	0.02	0.00
	Generators (600 kVA)	Marine	643	0.40	1.76	6.55	0.01	0.28	0.27	751.60	0.03	0.01
	Survey Boat	Marine	1131	0.89	4.49	12.70	0.01	0.60	0.59	1335.91	0.05	0.01
	Crew Boat	Marine	425	0.21	1.44	3.47	0.00	0.19	0.18	502.37	0.02	0.00
Installation of Cable Protection	Tugboat, Towboat	Marine	1970	1.67	8.66	23.20	0.02	1.18	1.14	2326.55	0.09	0.02
	Crew Boat	Marine	425	0.21	1.44	3.48	0.00	0.19	0.18	502.37	0.02	0.00
Cable Shipments <sup>3</sup>	OVG Main Propulsion	Marine (kW)	8201	10.85	25.31	307.36	65.45	8.14	7.59	10645.38	0.11	0.56
	OVG Auxiliary Engine	Marine (kW)	1776	1.57	4.31	54.42	16.60	1.92	1.76	2704.41	0.02	0.12

Notes:

lb/hr = pounds per hour

<sup>1</sup>Emission factors weighted for calendar year 2013 (EPA 2003, EPA 2006, EPA 2009a).<sup>2</sup>Offroad N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are based on 40 CFR 98, Subpart C.<sup>3</sup>Cable Shipment emissions based on EPA 2009b.

**Table K-3. Estimated Total Emissions,<sup>1</sup> Lake Champlain Segment**

Activity	Equipment and Vehicles			VOC lbs	CO lbs	NO <sub>x</sub> lbs	SO <sub>x</sub> lbs	PM <sub>10</sub> lbs	PM <sub>2.5</sub> lbs	CO <sub>2</sub> lbs	CH <sub>4</sub> lbs	N <sub>2</sub> O lbs	CO <sub>2</sub> -eqv lbs
	Type	Category	Hours										
Cable Installation	2 Azimuth Units	Marine	1584	3,265	16,562	46,845	44	2,230	2,162	4,928,318	193	39	4,944,351
	Azimuth Unit	Marine	792	842	4,266	12,066	12	574	557	1,269,415	49	10	1,273,545
	Retractable Azimuth Unit	Marine	317	612	3,106	8,783	8	418	406	924,059	36	7	927,065
	Tunnel Unit	Marine	792	804	4,078	11,534	11	549	533	1,213,412	47	10	1,217,359
	Generators (500 kVA)	Marine	9504	3,175	13,920	51,773	52	2,204	2,138	5,941,135	235	47	5,960,665
	Generators (600 kVA)	Marine	1584	635	2,783	10,351	11	441	427	1,187,857	47	10	1,191,762
	Survey Boat	Marine	1584	1,399	7,095	20,068	18	955	927	2,111,337	82	16	2,118,205
	Crew Boat	Marine	634	132	911	2,198	3	120	116	317,587	13	3	318,620
Installation of Cable Protection	Tugboat, Towboat	Marine	396	659	3,423	9,167	8	465	450	919,246	36	7	922,238
	Crew Boat	Marine	317	7	46	108	0	6	6	15,714	1	0	15,765
Cable Shipments	OVG Main Propulsion	Marine (kW)	95	998	2,329	28,277	6,022	749	698	979,364	10	51	995,558
	OVG Auxiliary Engine	Marine (kW)	32	49	135	1,702	519	60	55	84,593	1	4	85,780
<b>Total Underwater Cable Laying Emissions, lbs</b>				<b>12,578</b>	<b>58,653</b>	<b>202,874</b>	<b>6,706</b>	<b>8,771</b>	<b>8,476</b>	<b>19,892,038</b>	<b>751</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>19,970,913</b>
<b>Total Underwater Cable Laying Emissions, tons</b>				<b>6.29</b>	<b>29.33</b>	<b>101.44</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>4.39</b>	<b>4.24</b>	<b>9946.02</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>9,985</b>

Notes:

lb pound

<sup>1</sup>Emissions weighted for calendar year 2013 (EPA 2003, EPA 2006, EPA 2009a).<sup>2</sup>Carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>-eqv) are calculated by summing the products of mass GHG emissions by species times their respective global warming potential coefficients (EPA 2014).

**Table K-4. Estimated Equipment and Vehicle Use during Terrestrial Cable Installation, Overland Segment**

Activity	Equipment and Vehicles				Working Days (57 miles)	Daily Hours	# Equipment Hours Operation (57 miles)	Miles Per Hour (on road only)	VMT
	Equipment Type	Progress (miles)/8 hour day	BHP	Qty					
Vegetation Clearing	Brush Hog	1	11	1	57	8	456		
Topsoil Removal and Storage	Small Bulldozer	1	285	1	57	8	456		
	Bobcat	1	73	1	57	8	456		
Access Path Prep (gravel)	Small Bulldozer	0.5	285	1	114	8	912		
	18-yard dump	0.5		2	114	8	1824	5	9,120
Trench Excavation	Backhoe	0.25	73	1	228	8	1824		
	Bobcat	0.25	73	1	228	8	1824		
	Ram Hoe	0.25	330	1	228	4	912		
	Hard Rock Trencher	0.25	335	1	228	2	456		
Deliver Cable @ 3 reels per??	Flatbed Truck, 30 mph	0.5		1	114	8	912	30	27,360
	Crane	0.5	300	1	114	2	228		
Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD) <sup>1</sup>	Drilling Unit				532	8	4256		
	Drilling Power Unit		800		532	8	4256		
	Generator		50		532	8	4256		
	Water Pumps				532	8	4256		
	Mud Pump				532	8	4256		
Site Delivery and Pull Cable	Flatbed Truck, 30 mph	0.5		1	114	8	912	30	27,360
	Crane, 40-ton	0.5		1	114	2	228		
	Puller/Tensioner	0.5	165	2	114	8	1824		
	Mid-pull Caterpillars	0.5	165	2	114	8	1824		
Splice Cable	Generators	0.25	48	1	228	8	1824		
	Propane Heaters	0.25	0.5	1	228	8	1824		
Deliver and Install Thermal Backfill	18-yard dump	0.25		2	228	8	3648	30	10,9440
	Backhoe	0.25	73	1	228	8	1824		
	Bobcat	0.25	73	1	228	8	1824		
Install Native Backfill	Backhoe	0.5	73	1	114	8	912		
	Bobcat	0.5	73	1	114	8	912		
	Shaker/Screen	0.5	110	1	114	8	912		

Activity	Equipment and Vehicles				Working Days (57 miles)	Daily Hours	# Equipment Hours Operation (57 miles)	Miles Per Hour (on road only)	VMT
	Equipment Type	Progress (miles)/8 hour day	BHP	Qty					
	Compressor for Tampers	0.5		1	114	8	912		
Remove Excess Native Fill from Site	18-yard dump	1		2	57	8	912	5	4,560
	Backhoe	1	73	1	57	8	456		
Replace Topsoil, York Rake	Small Bulldozer	0.5	285	1	114	8	912		
	Hydroseed Sprayer	0.5	115	1	114	8	912		
Miscellaneous <sup>2</sup>	Pickup Trucks			10	220	4	8800	30	264,000

Notes:

Overland equipment estimate assumes approximately 57 miles.

BHP: Brake-horsepower. This should be the maximum rated load of the vehicle or vessel engine(s).

<sup>1</sup>HDD includes HDD and Jack & Bore for 38 upland locations and entry/exit from Lake Champlain. Installation day assumptions are as follows:

	Quantity	Days per Installation	Total
Jack and Bore	13	10	130
300 ft HDD	4	7	28
500 ft HDD	7	13	91
1,000 ft HDD	11	18	198
1,500 ft HDD	1	25	25
2,000 ft HDD	2	30	60
	<b>Total</b>		<b>532</b>

Notes:

ft = feet

<sup>2</sup>Miscellaneous pickup truck use based on estimate of length of construction season (i.e., late spring to fall).



Table K-5. Emission Factors,<sup>1,2</sup> Overland Segment

Activity	Equipment and Vehicles			VOC lb/unit	CO lb/unit	NOx lb/unit	SOx lb/unit	PM <sub>10</sub> lb/unit <sup>3</sup>	PM <sub>2.5</sub> lb/unit <sup>3</sup>	CO <sub>2</sub> lb/unit <sup>6</sup>	CH <sub>4</sub> lb/unit <sup>4,5</sup>	N <sub>2</sub> O lb/unit <sup>4,5</sup>
	Equipment Type	Category	BHP									
Vegetation Clearing	Brush Hog	Off Road	11	0.02	0.11	0.11	0.00	0.01	0.01	14.27	0.00	0.00
Topsoil Removal and Storage	Small Bulldozer	Off Road	285	0.15	0.61	1.80	0.00	0.12	0.11	336.87	0.01	0.00
	Bobcat	Off Road	73	0.20	1.01	0.91	0.00	0.15	0.15	111.42	0.00	0.00
Access Path Prep (gravel)	Small Bulldozer	Off Road	285	0.15	0.61	1.80	0.00	0.12	0.11	336.87	0.01	0.00
	18-yard dump	On Road HHD		0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.70	0.00	0.00
Trench Excavation	Backhoe	Off Road	73	0.20	1.01	0.91	0.00	0.15	0.15	111.42	0.00	0.00
	Bobcat	Off Road	73	0.20	1.01	0.91	0.00	0.15	0.15	111.42	0.00	0.00
	Ram Hoe	Off Road	330	0.14	0.94	2.35	0.00	0.13	0.13	390.14	0.01	0.00
	Hard Rock Trencher	Off Road	335	0.24	1.61	3.40	0.00	0.22	0.21	395.76	0.02	0.00
Cable Delivery	Flatbed Truck, 30 mph	On Road HHD		0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.70	0.00	0.00
	Crane	Off Road	300	0.17	0.47	2.22	0.00	0.10	0.09	350.73	0.01	0.00
Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD) <sup>1</sup>	Drilling Unit	Off Road		0.89	3.39	11.69	0.01	0.54	0.52	933.94	0.04	0.01
	Generator	Off Road	50	0.03	0.18	0.53	0.00	0.03	0.03	64.97	0.00	0.00
Site Delivery and Pull Cable	Flatbed Truck, 30 mph	On Road HHD		0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.70	0.00	0.00
	Crane, 40-ton	Off Road		0.17	0.47	2.22	0.00	0.10	0.09	350.73	0.01	0.00
	Puller/Tensioner	Off Road	165	0.34	1.28	2.02	0.00	0.23	0.22	226.92	0.01	0.00
	Mid-pull Caterpillars	Off Road	165	0.34	1.28	2.02	0.00	0.23	0.22	226.92	0.01	0.00
Splice Cable	Generators	Off Road	48	0.03	0.18	0.51	0.00	0.03	0.03	62.37	0.00	0.00
	Propane Heaters	Off Road	0.5	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.64	0.00	0.00
Deliver and Install Thermal Backfill	18-yard dump	On Road HHD		0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.70	0.00	0.00
	Backhoe	Off Road	73	0.20	1.01	0.91	0.00	0.15	0.15	111.42	0.00	0.00
	Bobcat	Off Road	73	0.20	1.01	0.91	0.00	0.15	0.15	111.42	0.00	0.00
Install Native Backfill	Backhoe	Off Road	73	0.20	1.01	0.91	0.00	0.15	0.15	111.42	0.00	0.00
	Bobcat	Off Road	73	0.20	1.01	0.91	0.00	0.15	0.15	111.42	0.00	0.00
	Shaker/Screen	Off Road	110	0.07	0.22	0.90	0.00	0.05	0.05	128.57	0.01	0.00
	Compressor for	Off Road		0.03	0.12	0.22	0.00	0.02	0.02	25.94	0.00	0.00

Activity	Equipment and Vehicles			VOC lb/unit	CO lb/unit	NOx lb/unit	SOx lb/unit	PM <sub>10</sub> lb/unit <sup>3</sup>	PM <sub>2.5</sub> lb/unit <sup>3</sup>	CO <sub>2</sub> lb/unit <sup>6</sup>	CH <sub>4</sub> lb/unit <sup>4,5</sup>	N <sub>2</sub> O lb/unit <sup>4,5</sup>
	Equipment Type	Category	BHP									
	Tampers											
Remove Excess Native Fill from Site	18-yard dump	On Road HHD		0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.70	0.00	0.00
	Backhoe	Off Road	73	0.20	1.01	0.91	0.00	0.15	0.15	111.42	0.00	0.00
Replace Topsoil, York Rake	Small Bulldozer	Off Road	285	0.15	0.61	1.80	0.00	0.12	0.11	336.87	0.01	0.00
	Hydroseed Sprayer	Off Road	115	0.27	0.99	1.64	0.00	0.17	0.17	158.04	0.01	0.00
Miscellaneous	Pickup Trucks	On Road LD		0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.97	0.00	0.00

## Notes:

HDD: Horizontal Directional Drilling. LD: Light Duty. HHD: Heavy Heavy Duty.

<sup>1</sup>Emission factors weighted for calendar year 2013.

<sup>2</sup>Units are operating hours for offroad engines, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for onroad vehicles.

<sup>3</sup>Offroad diesel exhaust PM<sub>2.5</sub>=92% of PM<sub>10</sub>; Onroad HHD particulate emission factors include allowances for tire and brake wear.

<sup>4</sup>Offroad N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are based on 40 CFR 98, Subpart C.

<sup>5</sup>Onroad N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are based on the Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2008 (EPA 2009b).

<sup>6</sup>Onroad CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are based on EPA420-F-05-001 which rates gasoline emissions at 19.4 lb/gas and diesel at 22.2 lb/gas (EPA 2005).

**Table K-6. Fugitive Dust Estimation Calculations-Earthmoving, Overland Segment**

<b>Construction Earthmoving</b>	<b>Project Hours</b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub> lb/hr</b>	<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub> lb/hr</b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub> lbs</b>	<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub> lbs</b>
<b>Topsoil Removal and Storage</b>					
Small Bulldozer	456	16.64	4.91	7,588	2,239
Bobcat	456	0.00034	0.000052	0.16	0.02
<b>Access Path Prep (gravel)</b>					
Small Bulldozer	912	16.64	4.91	15,175.68	4,477.92
18-yard dump	1824	0.00034	0.000052	0.62	0.09
<b>Trench Excavation</b>					
Backhoe	1824	0.00034	0.000052	0.62	0.09
Bobcat	1824	0.103	0.005126	187.87	9.35
Ram Hoe	912	0.103	0.005126	93.94	4.67
Hard Rock Trencher	456	0.103	0.005126	46.97	2.34
<b>Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD)1</b>					
Drilling Unit	4256	0.00034	0.000052	1.45	0.22
Generator	4256	0.00034	0.000052	1.45	0.22
<b>Deliver and Install Thermal Backfill</b>					
18-yard dump	3648	0.00034	0.000052	1.24	0.19
Backhoe	1824	0.00034	0.000052	0.62	0.09
Bobcat	1824	16.64	4.91	30,351.36	8,955.84
<b>Install Native Backfill</b>					
Backhoe	912	0.00034	0.000052	0.31	0.05
Bobcat	912	16.64	4.91	15,175.68	4,477.92
Shaker/Screen	912	0.00034	0.000052	0.31	0.05
Compressor for Tampers	912	0.00034	0.000052	0.31	0.05
<b>Remove Excess Native Fill from Site</b>					
18-yard dump	912	0.00034	0.000052	0.31	0.05
Backhoe	456	0.00034	0.000052	0.16	0.02
<b>Replace Topsoil, York Rake</b>					
Small Bulldozer	912	16.64	4.91	15,175.68	4,477.92
Hydroseed Sprayer	912	0.10328	0.005124	94.19	4.67
<b>Total Earthmoving Dust Emissions (lbs)</b>				<b>83,896.75</b>	<b>24,650.75</b>
<b>Total Earthmoving Dust Emissions (tons)</b>				<b>41.95</b>	<b>12.33</b>

Notes:

HDD: Horizontal Directional Drilling

Based on EPA 2006 (EPA 2006).

AP-42 Section 11.9 for dozing (Table 11.9-1):

 $E = 0.75 * (s)^{1.5} / (M)^{1.4}$  for PM<sub>10</sub> $E = 0.105 * 5.7 * (s)^{1.2} / (M)^{1.3}$  for PM<sub>2.5</sub>

E = lb/hr fugitive

s = Silt Content assumed to be 55% for construction sites. (CHPEI 2010)

M = moisture content = 8% (assumes unwatered subsoil)

AP-42 Section 11.9 for grading, rolling, and excavating (Table 11.9-1) (EPA 2006)

 $E = S * 0.60 * 0.051 * (S)^{2.0}$  for PM<sub>10</sub> $E = S * 0.031 * 0.040 * (S)^{2.5}$  for PM<sub>2.5</sub>Simplifies to  $E = 0.60 * 0.051 * (S)^{3.0}$  for PM<sub>10</sub>Simplified to  $E = 0.031 * 0.040 * (S)^{3.5}$  for PM<sub>2.5</sub>

E = lb/VMT \* VMT/hr = lb/hr fugitive

S = Mean Vehicle Speed assumed to be 3 mph for graders, 1.5 mph for excavators & rollers  
Assumes VMT = S \* hours of use

AP-42 Section 13.2.4 Loading/Handling (digger, driller, backhoe, loader): (EPA 2006)

$E = 0.35 * 0.0032 * (U/5)^{1.3} / (M/2)^{1.4}$  for PM<sub>10</sub>

$E = 0.053 * 0.0032 * (U/5)^{1.3} / (M/2)^{1.4}$  for PM<sub>2.5</sub>

E = lb/ton \* tons/hr = lb/hr fugitive

U = average wind speed is 8.9 mph for Albany, New York (NOAA 2002)

M = moisture content = 8% (assumes unwatered subsoil)

**Table K-7. Fugitive Dust Estimation Calculations-Road Dust<sup>1</sup>, Overland Segment**

Construction Road Dust	Project VMT	PM <sub>10</sub> lb/VMT	PM <sub>2.5</sub> lb/VMT	PM <sub>10</sub> lbs	PM <sub>2.5</sub> lbs
<b>All Roads</b>					
Pickup Truck	264,000				
Flatbed Truck	54,720				
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>318,720</b>				
<b>Paved Roads</b>					
Pickup Truck	237,600	0.00622	0.00076	1,478	181
Flatbed Truck	49,248	0.20521	0.03061	10,106	1,507
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>286,848</b>			<b>11,584</b>	<b>1,688</b>
<b>Unpaved Roads</b>					
Pickup Truck	26,400	0.06820	0.00682	1,800	180
Flatbed Truck	5,472	0.19222	0.01922	1,052	105
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>31,872</b>			<b>2,852</b>	<b>285</b>
<b>Total Road Dust Emissions (lbs)</b>				<b>14,436</b>	<b>1,973</b>
<b>Total Road Dust Emissions (tons)</b>				<b>7.22</b>	<b>0.99</b>

Notes:

<sup>1</sup>Assumes 90% of roads are paved.

Based on EPA 2006 and EPA 2003.

Unpaved Road Dust (AP-42 Section 13.2.2):

 $E = 1.5 * (s/12)^{0.9} * (W/3)^{0.45} * PC * (1-CE)$  for PM<sub>10</sub> $E = 0.15 * (s/12)^{0.9} * (W/3)^{0.45} * PC * (1-CE)$  for PM<sub>2.5</sub>

E = lb/VMT fugitive

s = surface silt content = 9%

(average for unpaved roads and construction sites, AP-42 Table 13.2.2-1)

W = average vehicle weight (see below)

 $PC = (365 - P / 365)$ 

CE = Control Efficiency for watering = 90% for M between 4 and 5

(AP-42 Figure 13.2.2-2)

Based on EPA 2006.

Paved Road Dust (AP-42 Section 13.2.1)

 $E = 0.016 * (sL/2)^{0.65} * (W/3)^{1.5} - 0.00047 * PC$  for PM<sub>10</sub> $E = 0.0024 * (sL/2)^{0.65} * (W/3)^{1.5} - 0.00036 * PC$  for PM<sub>2.5</sub>

E = lb/VMT fugitive

sL = Silt Loading assumed to be 0.5 g/m<sup>2</sup> for average ADT categories from Table 13.2.1-3

Note: precipitation correction not used (PC=1) for worst case day calculations

 $PC = (1 - P / 4N)$ 

P = number of wet days over 0.01 in precipitation for averaging period

(150 days/year average for New York State)

N = days of period = 365 days

Vehicle Weights based on EPA 2010.

Light Duty = 3 tons average

Medium Duty = 8 tons average

Heavy Heavy Duty = 30 tons average (loaded 40 tons, unloaded 20 tons)

**Table K-8. Estimated Total Emissions<sup>1</sup> Overland Segment**

Activity	Equipment and Vehicles				VOC	CO	NO <sub>x</sub>	SO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub> -eqv
	Equipment Type	Category	Hours	VMT										
Vegetation Clearing	Brush Hog	Off Road	456		9	50	50	0	5	5	6,507	0	0	6,507
Topsoil Removal and Storage	Small Bulldozer	Off Road	456		68	278	821	0	55	50	153,613	5	0	153,708
	Bobcat	Off Road	456		91	461	415	0	68	68	50,808	0	0	50,808
Access Path Prep (gravel)	Small Bulldozer	Off Road	912		137	556	1,642	0	109	100	307,225	9	0	307,417
	18-yard dump	On Road HHD	1,824	9,120	0	91	182	0	0	0	33,744	0	0	33,744
Trench Excavation	Backhoe	Off Road	1,824		365	1,842	1,660	0	274	274	203,230	0	0	203,230
	Bobcat	Off Road	1,824		365	1,842	1,660	0	274	274	203,230	0	0	203,230
	Ram Hoe	Off Road	912		128	857	2,143	0	119	119	355,808	9	0	355,999
	Hard Rock Trencher	Off Road	456		109	734	1,550	0	100	96	180,467	9	0	180,658
Deliver Cable @ 3 reels	Flatbed Truck, 30 mph	On Road HHD	912	27,360	0	0	274	0	0	0	101,232	0	0	101,232
	Crane	Off Road	228		39	107	506	0	23	21	79,966	2	0	80,014
Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD)	Drilling Unit	Off Road	4,256		3,788	14,428	49,753	43	2,298	2,213	3,974,849	170	43	3,991,617
	Generator	Off Road	4,256		128	766	2,256	0	128	128	276,512	0	0	276,512
Site Delivery and Pull Cable	Flatbed Truck, 30 mph	On Road HHD	912	27,360	0	0	274	0	0	0	101,232	0	0	101,232
	Crane, 40-ton	Off Road	228		39	107	506	0	23	21	79,966	2	0	80,014
	Puller/Tensioner	Off Road	1,824		620	2,335	3,684	0	420	401	413,902	18	0	414,285
	Mid-pull Caterpillars	Off Road	1,824		620	2,335	3,684	0	420	401	413,902	18	0	414,285
Splice Cable	Generators	Off Road	1,824		55	328	930	0	55	55	113,763	0	0	113,763
	Propane Heaters	Off Road	1,824		0	18	36	0	0	0	37,647	0	0	37,647
Deliver and Install Thermal Backfill	18-yard dump	On Road HHD	3,648	109,440	0	1,094	2,189	0	0	0	404,928	0	0	404,928
	Backhoe	Off Road	1,824		365	1,842	1,660	0	274	274	203,230	0	0	203,230
	Bobcat	Off Road	1,824		365	1,842	1,660	0	274	274	203,230	0	0	203,230
Install Native Backfill	Backhoe	Off Road	912		182	921	830	0	137	137	101,615	0	0	101,615
	Bobcat	Off Road	912		182	921	830	0	137	137	101,615	0	0	101,615
	Shaker/Screen	Off Road	912		64	201	821	0	46	46	117,256	9	0	117,447
	Compressor for Tampers	Off Road	912		27	109	201	0	18	18	23,657	0	0	23,657
Remove Excess Native Fill from Site	18-yard dump	On Road HHD	912	4,560	0	46	91	0	0	0	16,872	0	0	16,872
	Backhoe	Off Road	456		91	461	415	0	68	68	50,808	0	0	50,808
Replace Topsoil, York Rake	Small Bulldozer	Off Road	912		137	556	1,642	0	109	100	307,225	9	0	307,417
	Hydroseed Sprayer	Off Road	912		246	903	1,496	0	155	155	144,132	9	0	144,324
Miscellaneous	Pickup Trucks	On Road LD	8,800	264,000	0	5,280	0	0	0	0	256,080	0	0	256,080
<b>Total Combustion Emissions (lbs)</b>					<b>8,220</b>	<b>41,313</b>	<b>83,860</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>5,586</b>	<b>5,432</b>	<b>9,018,252</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>9,037,128</b>
<b>Total Fugitive Dust Emissions (lbs)</b>									<b>98,333</b>	<b>26,624</b>				
<b>Total Combustion and Fugitive Dust Emissions (lbs)</b>					<b>8,220</b>	<b>41,313</b>	<b>83,860</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>103,919</b>	<b>32,057</b>	<b>9,018,252</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>9,037,128</b>
<b>Total Combustion and Fugitive Dust Emissions (tons)</b>					<b>4.11</b>	<b>20.66</b>	<b>41.93</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>51.96</b>	<b>16.03</b>	<b>4,509.13</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>4,518.56</b>

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

## References

- Code of Federal Regulations. 40 CFR 98 Electronic. Mandatory Greenhouse Gas Reporting. Title 40, Part 98, Subpart C. Available online: <<http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov>>.
- Champlain Hudson Power Express, Inc. (CHPEI). 2010. Champlain Hudson Power Express Project, Supplement to the Article VII Application. Appendix D
- U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1996. AP-42. Large Stationary Diesel and All Stationary Dual-fuel Engines. Table 3.4-1. Page 3.4-5.
- U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2003. MOBILE6.2.0.3 Mobile Vehicle Emissions Factor Model and AP-42 Methods for Re-entrained Road Dust. September 2003.
- U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2005. Office of Transportation and Air Quality. Emission Facts –Average Carbon Dioxide Emissions Resulting from Gasoline and Diesel Fuel. EPA420-F-05-001. February 2005.
- U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2006. AP 42, Fifth Edition, Volume 1, Chapter 13: Miscellaneous Sources. Available online: <[www.epa.gov](http://www.epa.gov)>.
- U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2009a. Office of Transportation and Air Quality. “NONROAD2008a Installation and Updates.” Available online: <<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/models/nonrdmdl/nonrdmdl2008/readme08.htm>>.
- U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2009b. Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2008.
- U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2010. Office of Transportation and Air Quality. Draft Regulatory Impact Analysis. EPA-420-D-10-901. October 2010.
- U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2014. Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2012. EPA 430-R-14-003. April 15, 2014.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 2002. Weather Data. Available online: <[www.noaa.gov](http://www.noaa.gov)>.



This page intentionally left blank

## **APPENDIX L CONTRACTOR DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

## Exhibit A

### NEPA DISCLOSURE STATEMENT FOR PREPARATION OF THE *NEW ENGLAND CLEAN POWER LINK ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT*

CEQ Regulations at 40 CFR 1506.5(c), which have been adopted by the DOE (10 CFR 1021), require contractors who will prepare an EIS to execute a disclosure specifying that they have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project. The term "financial interest or other interest in the outcome of the project" for purposes of this disclosure is defined in the March 23, 1981 guidance "Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations," 46 FR 8026-18038 at Question 17a and b.

"Financial or other interest in the outcome of the project" includes "any financial benefit such as a promise of future construction or design work in the project, as well as indirect benefits the contractor is aware of (e.g., if the project would aid proposals sponsored by the firm's other clients)." 46 FR 18026-18038 at 18031.

In accordance with these requirements, the offer or and any proposed subcontractors hereby certify as follows: (check either (a) or (b) to assure consideration of your proposal).


(a)  Offer or and any proposed subcontractor have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project.

(b)  Offer or and any proposed subcontractor have the following financial or other interest in the outcome of the project and hereby agree to divest themselves of such interest prior to award of this contract.

Financial or Other Interests

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Certified by

Signature 

Scott R. Ault, Senior Vice President

Printed Name and Title

Kleinschmidt Associates

Company

July 28, 2014

Date

This Page Intentionally Left Blank