GREAT-NC Disadvantage Indicators

	ETC EXPLORER FINDINGS*								
ID	Climate + Disaster Risk Burden	Environmental Burden	Health Vulnerability	Social Vulnerability	Transportation Insecurity	Counties Served within 3 Miles	County + NCDOC Tier	% CEJST	% АРР
1	26%	33%	35%	63%	70%	McDowell	McDowell (2)	94.1%	0.0%
2	25%	36%	35%	63%	74%	McDowell, Rutherford	McDowell (2), Rutherford (1)	72.0%	71.6%
3	55%	50%	70%	65%	69%	Cleveland	Cleveland (2)	100%	0%
4	13%	13%	34%	52%	74%	Ashe	Ashe (2)	0.0%	100.0%
5	50%	32%	74%	84%	85%	Robeson	Robeson (1)	100%	100%
6	50%	58%	52%	46%	53%	Granville	Granville (2)	50.7%	23.9%
7	33%	31%	43%	55%	69%	<u>Johnston</u>	Johnston (3)	100.0%	15.9%
8	20%	19%	42%	73%	88%	Warren	Warren (1)	100.0%	98.4%
9	54%	13%	51%	41%	72%	Brunswick	Brunswick (3)	71.5%	42.5%
10	65%	32%	49%	43%	53%	Brunswick	Brunswick (3)	51.3%	10.9%
11	56%	35%	53%	64%	61%	Beaufort, Pitt	Beaufort (2), Pitt (1)	79.0%	100.0%
12	58%	23%	59%	67%	73%	Beaufort	Beaufort (2)	100.0%	100.0%

^{*}Note: Table cells highlighted in red identify indicators for which the CT qualifies as disadvantaged (score of 65 percent or higher). These values were calculated using averaged ETC data for counties within a 3-mile bikeshed around each proposed facility.