Supplemental Tables to Accompany

Green for All: Integrating Air Quality and Environmental Justice into the Clean Energy Transition

Bridget Diana, Michael Ash, and James K. Boyce
Political Economy Research Institute (PERI)
University of Massachusetts Amherst
March 9, 2021

Table of Contents

Table S-1: Top Twenty CO2 Emitters Among Electrical Generating Facilities
Table S-2: Top Twenty CO2 Emitters Among Natural Gas Electrical Generating Facilities
Table S-3: Top Twenty Co-Pollutant Damages Generators Among Electrical Generating Facilities
Table S-4: Top Twenty Co-Pollutant Damages Generators Among Natural Gas Electrical Generating Facilities
Table S-5. EJ Population Shares Near Electrical-Generation Facilities, by Fuel Type
Table S-6: Co-Pollutant Damages for All and EJ populations, by Fuel
Table S-7: Plant Characteristics and Demographics by CO2 efficiency
Table S-8: Comparing Decarbonization Scenarios
Table S-9: Annual Benefits and Costs of Including Air Quality and Environmental Justice in Decarbonization Program
Table S-10: Regional Changes in Co-Pollutant Damages from All Fossil Fuel Electrical Generation Facilities
Table S-11: Regional Change in Co-Pollutant Damages from Natural Gas Electrical Generation Facilities
Table S-12: Companies Adopting Science-Based Targets with High (Top 100) US EPA RSEI Air Risk or Water Hazard
Figure S-1: Map of eGRID Subregions

Table S-1: Top Twenty CO2 Emitters Among Electrical Generating Facilities

							Demographics within 5 km of the facility			
Facility	County	State	Fuel	CO2 output (1000 mt)	kg CO2 per MWh	Co-Pollutant damages per 1000 mt CO2 ($/1000 mt)	Population	Share Black	Share Hispanic	Share low income
Scherer	Monroe	GA	Coal	16,690	1,082	10,537	2,324	20%	13%	48%
Monroe	Monroe	MI	Coal	16,390	996	16,933	12,027	5%	6%	43%
Gibson	Gibson	IN	Coal	16,337	927	47,881	3,259	2%	1%	41%
Labadie	Franklin	MO	Coal	14,853	942	82,595	2,788	1%	2%	23%
Gen J.M. Gavin	Gallia	OH	Coal	14,469	904	103,234	962	0%	0%	41%
W.A. Parish	Fort Bend	TX	Coal	14,293	902	135,187	16,619	20%	22%	6%
Bowen	Bartow	GA	Coal	13,413	985	45,468	5,683	3%	4%	25%
Colstrip	Rosebud	MT	Coal	13,316	1,052	19,674	2,446	0%	14%	12%
John E. Amos	Putnam	WV	Coal	12,536	965	23,957	9,331	1%	0%	31%
Harrison Power Station	Harrison	WV	Coal	12,130	915	69,124	4,228	0%	1%	33%
Sherburne County	Sherburne	MN	Coal	12,073	968	36,741	5,397	1%	1%	13%
Keystone	Armstrong	PA	Coal	11,586	933	110,392	1,484	0%	0%	19%
Rockport	Spencer	IN	Coal	11,396	958	83,710	573	0%	13%	44%
Sam Seymour	Fayette	TX	Coal	10,898	1,052	8,381	741	9%	4%	10%
Ghent	Carroll	KY	Coal	10,731	953	74,126	861	2%	3%	54%
Conemaugh	Indiana	PA	Coal	10,718	936	38,935	2,411	1%	1%	38%
Cumberland	Stewart	TN	Coal	10,186	976	37,280	727	2%	1%	47%
Jeffrey Energy Center	Pottawatomie	KS	Coal	10,036	1,057	6,278	1,343	0%	4%	37%
Cross	Berkeley	SC	Coal	9,772	1,024	17,162	1,677	76%	0%	59%
Independence	Independence	AR	Coal	9,679	1,000	86,915	1,165	0%	3%	46%

The table lists the twenty fossil-fuel electrical generating plants with the CO2 emissions (1000 mt). Also shown are co-pollutant damages ($) from NOx, SO2, and PM2.5 estimated with the APEEP model. Population and demographic shares within 5 km of the facility are from the US Census.
Source: US EPA eGRID 2018, APEEP, US Census, and authors' calculations.

Table S-2: Top Twenty CO2 Emitters Among Natural Gas Electrical Generating Facilities

						Demographics within 5 km of the facility			
Facility	County	State	CO2 output (1000 mt)	kg CO2 per MWh	Co-Pollutant damages per 1000 mt CO2 ($/1000 mt)	Population	Share Black	Share Hispanic	Share low income
West County Energy Center	Palm Beach	FL	7,192	363	4,769	3,080	10%	37%	28%
Jack McDonough	Cobb	GA	6,187	368	13,677	60,340	40%	8%	25%
Martin	Martin	FL	5,378	418	7,867	1,107	0%	55%	64%
Richmond County Plant	Richmond	NC	5,235	440	4,999	3,572	17%	2%	47%
Ninemile Point	Jefferson	LA	4,123	445	12,245	124,278	31%	8%	34%
Forney Power Plant	Kaufman	TX	4,103	394	5,497	18,686	14%	20%	18%
Sanford	Volusia	FL	3,985	400	11,558	22,657	12%	19%	27%
Gila River Power Station	Maricopa	AZ	3,676	563	2,416	1,644	4%	64%	61%
Union Power Station	Union	AR	3,635	353	2,489	1,411	20%	0%	34%
Dynegy Hanging Rock Ii, Llc	Lawrence	OH	3,603	388	6,637	5,714	4%	1%	36%
Fort Myers	Lee	FL	3,522	379	5,855	19,058	3%	27%	40%
Mcintosh Combined Cycle Facility	Effingham	GA	3,417	377	2,902	2,659	6%	16%	24%
Polk	Polk	FL	3,323	404	8,261	1,303	25%	22%	50%
Brunswick County Power Station	Brunswick	VA	3,157	374	4,197	1,882	60%	0%	44%
Warren County Power Station	Warren	VA	3,048	372	1,356	6,772	9%	4%	20%
H.F. Lee Steam Electric Plant	Wayne	NC	3,036	421	7,362	5,075	22%	10%	37%
Odessa Ector Generating Station	Ector	TX	2,952	398	4,477	37,679	7%	59%	33%
P.L. Bartow	Pinellas	FL	2,932	415	14,661	35,774	10%	10%	28%
Midland Cogeneration Venture	Midland	MI	2,884	365	47,560	15,752	2%	4%	35%
Cottonwood Energy Project	Newton	TX	2,836	395	2,011	907	0%	0%	58%

The table lists the twenty natural gas electrical generating plants with the CO2 emissions (1000 mt). Also shown are co-pollutant damages ($) from NOx, SO2, and PM2.5 estimated with the APEEP model. Population and demographic shares within 5 km of the facility are from the US Census.
Source: US EPA eGRID 2018, APEEP, US Census, and authors' calculations.

Table S-3: Top Twenty Co-Pollutant Damages Generators Among Electrical Generating Facilities

								Demographics within 5 km of the facility			
Facility	County	State	Fuel	CO2 output (1000 mt)	kg CO2 per MWh	Co-pollutant damages ($ million)	Co-pollutant damages per 1000 mt CO2 ($/1000 mt)	Population	Share Black	Share Hispanic	Share low income
W.A. Parish	Fort Bend	TX	Coal	14,293	902	1,932.2	135,187	16,619	19.7%	22.4%	6.5%
Gen J.M. Gavin	Gallia	OH	Coal	14,469	904	1,493.7	103,234	962	0.0%	0.3%	41.2%
Keystone	Armstrong	PA	Coal	11,586	933	1,279.0	110,392	1,484	0.0%	0.0%	18.6%
Labadie	Franklin	MO	Coal	14,853	942	1,226.8	82,595	2,788	0.7%	1.5%	22.6%
Belle River	St Clair	MI	Coal	7,838	992	1,144.3	146,002	6,665	1.4%	0.6%	23.9%
W.H. Zimmer Generating Station	Clermont	OH	Coal	7,119	879	1,105.0	155,232	1,442	0.0%	2.6%	19.4%
Martin Lake	Rusk	TX	Coal	14,876	1,059	1,065.8	71,650	0			
Shawnee	McCracken	KY	Coal	7,305	1,162	1,037.9	142,085	7,536	5.4%	2.7%	46.3%
Rockport	Spencer	IN	Coal	11,396	958	953.9	83,710	573	0.0%	13.3%	44.0%
Miami Fort Power Station	Hamilton	OH	Coal	4,987	922	890.1	178,486	11,000	2.6%	0.8%	11.0%
Independence	Independence	AR	Coal	9,679	1,000	841.2	86,915	1,165	0.0%	3.4%	45.8%
Harrison Power Station	Harrison	WV	Coal	12,130	915	838.5	69,124	4,228	0.3%	1.1%	32.6%
St. Clair	St Clair	MI	Coal	4,753	1,049	828.0	174,195	4,672	1.1%	0.8%	29.8%
Cardinal	Jefferson	OH	Coal	9,470	943	809.9	85,530	3,889	0.6%	0.2%	36.1%
Ghent	Carroll	KY	Coal	10,731	953	795.5	74,126	861	2.4%	2.6%	54.5%
Gibson	Gibson	IN	Coal	16,337	927	782.2	47,881	3,259	2.5%	1.4%	41.3%
White Bluff	Jefferson	AR	Coal	8,457	1,025	770.6	91,120	2,489	4.5%	1.7%	41.6%
Rush Island	Jefferson	MO	Coal	7,082	912	705.2	99,566	0			
Archer Daniels Midland Co.	Macon	IL	Coal	665	499	687.2	1,032,730	19,853	21.2%	4.2%	48.8%
New Madrid Power Plant	New Madrid	MO	Coal	6,926	876	657.5	94,931	328	14.6%	0.0%	72.6%

The table lists the twenty electrical generating plants with the highest co-pollutant damages ($) from NOx, SO2, and PM2.5 estimated with the APEEP model. Population and demographic shares within 5 km of the facility are from the US Census.
Source: US EPA eGRID 2018, APEEP, US Census, and authors' calculations.

Table S-4: Top Twenty Co-Pollutant Damages Generators Among Natural Gas Electrical Generating Facilities

							Demographics within 5 km of the facility			
Facility	County	State	CO2 output (1000 mt)	kg CO2 per MWh	Co-pollutant damages ($ million)	Co-pollutant damages per 1000 mt CO2 ($/1000 mt)	Population	Share Black	Share Hispanic	Share low income
Astoria Energy	Queens	NY	2,583	407	336.5	130,286	965,526	16.1%	45.3%	42.1%
Bergen Generating Station	Bergen	NJ	1,650	418	231.0	139,987	220,924	4.2%	38.6%	26.7%
Midland Cogeneration Venture	Midland	MI	2,884	365	137.2	47,560	15,752	1.6%	3.6%	35.4%
Ravenswood Generating Station	Queens	NY	1,805	541	104.7	58,036	1,299,414	8.4%	20.5%	25.2%
Red Oak Power, LLC	Middlesex	NJ	1,647	386	87.9	53,389	75,128	9.6%	16.1%	20.1%
Watson Cogeneration	Los Angeles	CA	892	299	85.0	95,206	200,425	13.1%	53.3%	36.6%
Jack McDonough	Cobb	GA	6,187	368	84.6	13,677	60,340	40.0%	8.4%	24.5%
El Segundo Cogen	Los Angeles	CA	710	561	77.3	108,968	133,541	5.1%	27.1%	19.6%
Linden Generating Station	Union	NJ	2,084	396	74.7	35,855	169,308	22.2%	46.9%	37.4%
Astoria Generating Station	Queens	NY	725	663	69.5	95,949	1,154,395	23.3%	36.3%	39.2%
Doswell Limited Partnership	Hanover	VA	2,430	500	63.4	26,081	1,992	33.3%	10.1%	35.2%
Bayonne Energy Center	Hudson	NJ	393	509	63.3	160,962	193,396	22.2%	31.1%	35.5%
Big Sandy	Lawrence	KY	346	553	56.7	163,978	2,121	0.0%	0.8%	55.6%
New Castle	Lawrence	PA	273	620	51.8	189,780	7,537	2.1%	0.2%	33.4%
Ninemile Point	Jefferson	LA	4,123	445	50.5	12,245	124,278	31.5%	8.1%	33.6%
Allen	Shelby	TN	1,618	533	47.6	29,397	749	100.0%	0.0%	63.8%
Sanford	Volusia	FL	3,985	400	46.1	11,558	22,657	12.0%	19.3%	27.1%
Dearborn Industrial Generation	Wayne	MI	1,721	346	44.3	25,751	125,269	14.2%	33.0%	67.2%
Joliet 29	Will	IL	371	590	43.6	117,737	49,237	24.5%	29.2%	36.2%
P.L. Bartow	Pinellas	FL	2,932	415	43.0	14,661	35,774	9.7%	9.8%	28.4%

The table lists the twenty natural gas electrical generating plants with the highest co-pollutant damages ($) from NOx, SO2, and PM2.5 estimated with the APEEP model. Population and demographic shares within 5 km of the facility are from the US Census.
Source: US EPA eGRID 2018, APEEP, US Census, and authors' calculations.

Table S-5. EJ Population Shares Near Electrical-Generation Facilities, by Fuel Type

Extension of Table 1

	Black share within 5 km		Hispanic share within 5 km		Low income share within 5 km	
Fuel	**Mean**	**95th percentile**	**Mean**	**95th percentile**	**Mean**	**95th percentile**
Coal	8.1%	34.9%	6.1%	22.4%	32.3%	59.2%
Gas	13.4%	53.4%	19.8%	64.3%	34.8%	59.0%
Oil	13.1%	53.3%	10.0%	31.6%	28.9%	48.7%
Nuclear	8.5%	30.6%	5.7%	17.4%	27.3%	42.7%
US Counties	9.1%	42.4%	11.4%	53.0%	36.0%	54.0%
US Population	12.7%		18.7%		28.9%	

The table shows the demographic composition within 5 km of fossil fuel electrical-generation facilities by fuel type. The mean values describe the average facility. The 95th percentile values describe facilities that are up the upper end of the distribution of representation of Environmental Justice populations. The demographic composition around nuclear facilities is shown for comparison as are the composition of US Counties and the entire US Population.
Source: US EPA eGRID 2018 and US Census.

Table S-6: Co-Pollutant Damages for All and EJ populations, by Fuel

Extension of Table 2

		Co-pollutant damages		
Fuel	**All**	**Black**	**Hispanic**	**Low Income**
		Total ($ billion)		
Coal	55.3	4.0	3.6	17.5
Gas	6.6	1.1	1.4	2.2
Oil	1.2	0.3	0.1	0.4
		Per MWh ($/MWh)		
Coal	47.3	3.4	3.0	14.9
Gas	4.8	0.8	1.0	1.6
Oil	72.1	14.6	8.1	23.6

The table presents co-pollutant damages (total and per MWh estimated damages in dollars from SO2, NOx, and PM2.5 using the APEEP model) by fuel for the total population and for three EJ groups.

Table S-7: Plant Characteristics and Demographics by CO2 Efficiency
Extension of Table 3

	Least CO2-efficient	Most CO2-efficient
Fuel type		
Gas	30.25%	97.58%
Coal	69.75%	2.42%
Co-Pollutant damages per 1000 mt CO2	76,722	55,515
Population within 5 kilometers		
Mean population	16,821	71,513
Mean percent Black	8.18%	13.70%
Mean percent Hispanic	9.54%	20.07%
Mean percent low income	32.71%	35.42%
Population within 15 kilometers		
Mean population	122,611	432,075
Mean percent Black	9.00%	13.03%
Mean percent Hispanic	10.21%	20.22%
Mean percent low income	32.49%	33.61%

The columns divide fossil-fuel electrical generation facilities into the lowest and highest thirds of total electrical capacity by CO2-efficiency (CO2 emissions per kWh).

Table S-8: Comparing Decarbonization Scenarios

Outcome	Fuel	2018	Baseline	Carbon Alone	Carbon plus Air Quality	Carbon and Air Quality plus EJ
Electrical Generation		100	100	100	100	100
	Coal	**28.5**	**25.6**	**15.0**	**14.1**	**14.2**
	Gas	**33.6**	**31.3**	**41.9**	**41.6**	**41.5**
	Other	**22.3**	**21.3**	**21.3**	**21.5**	**21.5**
	Clean Renewable	**15.7**	**21.8**	**21.8**	**22.8**	**22.8**
CO2 Emissions		100	100	80	80	80
	Coal	**67.4**	**66.4**	**35.9**	**35.5**	**35.6**
	Gas	**32.6**	**33.2**	**43.8**	**44.0**	**43.9**
Co-pollutant damages		100	100	**66.7**	50	48.1
	Coal	**89.3**	**89.3**	**53.5**	**36.4**	**36.5**
	Gas	**10.7**	**10.7**	**13.2**	**13.5**	**11.6**
Co-pollutant damages for EJ Population (Black)		100	100	**66.8**	**55.0**	47.9
	Coal	**79.0**	**78.2**	**40.6**	**28.2**	**23.8**
	Gas	**21.0**	**21.8**	**26.1**	**26.8**	**24.1**
Co-pollutant damages for EJ Population (Hispanic)		100	100	**73.7**	**67.1**	47.9
	Coal	**71.4**	**73.0**	**41.6**	**33.4**	**22.7**
	Gas	**28.6**	**27.0**	**32.1**	**33.8**	**25.1**
Co-pollutant damages for EJ Population (Low Income)		100	100	**65.9**	**51.5**	48.5
	Coal	**88.6**	**88.5**	**51.9**	**37.2**	**36.2**
	Gas	**11.4**	**11.5**	**14.0**	**14.3**	**12.4**

The table shows results of simulated carbon reduction and co-pollutant sensitive carbon reduction programs in the key domains of electrical generation by fuel, CO2 emissions, copollutant damages in total and for EJ groups, and generation costs. The decarbonization target in all of the decarbonization columns is a 20 percent reduction from 2018 levels. Except for the electrical generation fuel mix and cost, results are limited to coal and natural gas. Values are expressed relative to a baseline of no decarbonization. Values in bold face are model results; values in standard font are imposed goals. The 2018 values are shown to establish that the baseline is broadly calibrated to actual values.

Table S-9: Annual Benefits and Costs of Including Air Quality and Environmental Justice in Decarbonization Program
Extension of Table 4

	Adding Air Quality	Adding Air Quality and EJ
Additional benefit	$9.56 bn	$10.61 bn
Additional cost	$4.81 bn	$4.84 bn
Net benefit	$4.75 bn	$5.77 bn

The table compares the additional benefits and additional costs of simulated co-pollutant sensitive carbon reduction programs to those of a 20% decarbonization alone program. Benefits are estimated damages avoided from SO2, NOx, and PM2.5 emissions (based on the APEEP model using standard EPA valuation methodology). Costs are the extra cost of supplying electricity so as to achieve the co-pollutant reduction goals.

Table S-10: Regional Changes in Co-Pollutant Damages from All Fossil Fuel Electrical Generation Facilities

	Percent change in co-pollutant damages from a 20% decarbonization relative to baseline			
Region	**All**	**Black**	**Hispanic**	**Low income**
CAMX	156.7%	219.8%	186.5%	168.0%
MROE	5.7%	5.2%	5.6%	5.7%
MROW	-6.1%	-1.5%	-8.2%	-7.7%
RFCW	-9.9%	-28.9%	-14.0%	-9.6%
SPNO	-13.0%	-9.4%	-4.4%	-16.5%
SRVC	-15.4%	-12.3%	-11.7%	-12.1%
RFCE	-18.0%	10.6%	58.8%	-22.1%
ERCT	-22.0%	-16.5%	-27.4%	-35.0%
SPSO	-28.5%	-64.2%	-4.2%	-31.1%
NEWE	-37.3%	-41.9%	-31.4%	-34.5%
SRMW	-46.7%	-17.6%	-45.0%	-39.1%
NYUP	-48.2%	-1.7%	-35.2%	-45.7%
SRSO	-52.4%	-30.6%	-64.5%	-48.3%
NYCW	-62.8%	-62.1%	-65.1%	-63.1%
SRTV	-66.2%	-51.7%	-73.1%	-60.9%
FRCC	-67.2%	-63.6%	-61.1%	-69.9%
AZNM	-72.9%	-0.3%	-35.2%	-75.3%
SRMV	-80.3%	-63.2%	-38.8%	-82.3%
RMPA	-86.2%	-77.6%	-86.8%	-89.9%
NWPP	-88.1%	-19.4%	-83.4%	-82.1%
RFCM	-90.0%	-79.9%	-88.4%	-88.9%
NYLI	-91.5%	-96.0%	-92.2%	-92.9%

The table shows the percent change in damages from copollutants from all fossil-fuel electrical generation facilities for a 20% decarbonization relative to baseline damages from copollutants from these facilities for all people, for Black people, for Hispanic people, and for people living below 200% of hte Federal Poverty Line. A positive value indicates that the copollutant damages from natural gas facilities increases under the 20% decarbonization program. Change in damages is based on a linear programming simulation of a 20% decarbonization program. See Figure S-1 for Map of Electricity Subregions.

Table S-11: Regional Change in Co-Pollutant Damages from Natural Gas Electrical Generation Facilities

	Percent change in co-pollutant damages from a 20% decarbonization relative to baseline			
Region	**All**	**Black**	**Hispanic**	**Low income**
CAMX	155.9%	219.6%	186.1%	166.9%
SRTV	105.0%	230.2%	79.4%	116.0%
NWPP	104.4%	99.3%	61.7%	125.8%
RFCE	101.0%	88.6%	169.8%	105.9%
AZNM	57.0%	69.9%	34.3%	22.6%
RMPA	51.8%	31.9%	53.4%	49.2%
SRMV	51.0%	43.6%	56.4%	49.5%
SRMW	48.4%	46.7%	56.9%	49.5%
SRVC	47.8%	44.0%	43.5%	39.7%
SRSO	35.1%	38.9%	17.4%	39.9%
RFCM	25.3%	10.6%	17.2%	22.1%
SPSO	21.8%	36.1%	27.8%	23.8%
RFCW	18.7%	20.3%	31.9%	20.0%
MROW	17.8%	19.1%	10.1%	14.1%
NYUP	17.4%	3.2%	-23.7%	14.8%
ERCT	17.2%	20.8%	16.7%	16.7%
MROE	16.1%	7.9%	-1.2%	13.6%
FRCC	11.0%	-3.7%	-7.2%	4.9%
SPNO	-3.3%	-19.7%	-7.2%	-3.4%
NEWE	-19.1%	-26.6%	-14.5%	-17.8%
NYCW	-62.8%	-62.1%	-65.1%	-63.1%
NYLI	-91.5%	-96.0%	-92.2%	-92.9%

The table shows the percent change in damages from copollutants from natural gas facilities for a 20% decarbonization relative to baseline damages from copollutants from natural gas facilities for all people, for Black people, for Hispanic people, and for people living below 200% of the Federal Poverty Line. A positive value indicates that the copollutant damages from natural gas facilities increases under the 20% decarbonization program. Change in damages is based on a linear programming simulation of a 20% decarbonization program. See Figure S-1 for Map of Electricity Subregions.

Table S-12: Companies Adopting Science-Based Targets with High (Top 100) US EPA RSEI Air Risk or Water Hazard

Extension of Table 5

Company Adopting Science-Based Target	PERI Toxic 100 Parent Company	Headquarters	Sector	Rank among all US polluters	Nonwhite Share	Low Income Share
A. Top Air Polluters Based on US EPA RSEI Air Score						
Clariant AG	Clariant	Switzerland	Chemicals	8	58.2	33.2
Croda International Pl	CRODA INC	United Kingdom	Chemicals	11	49.7	34.0
Terumo Corporatio	Terumo	Japan	Healthcare Equipment and Supplies	14	32.4	25.0
Ecolab	Ecolab	Minnesota, USA	Chemicals	17	78.7	36.4
Klöckner & Co	Klockner	Germany	Mining - Metals (Iron, Aluminium, Other Metals)	35	59.2	39.7
AkzoNobel	Akzo Nobel	Netherlands	Chemicals	50	70.3	42.0
Ardagh Group S.A.	Ardagh Group	Luxembourg	Containers and Packaging	62	43.1	25.2
Linde plc	Linde	United Kingdom	Chemicals	74	47.6	44.5
Solvay	Solvay	Belgium	Chemicals	77	57.2	35.6
Kingspan Group Plc	Kingspan PLC	Ireland	Building Products	97	18.1	27.4
B. Top Water Polluters Based on US EPA RSEI Water Hazard						
Clariant AG	Clariant	Switzerland	Chemicals	7	56.6	30.9
Nemak, S.A.B. de C.V.	Alfa S.A.B.	Mexico	Automobiles and Components	19	42.9	34.6
Cargill, Inc.	Cargill	Minnesota, USA	Food and Beverage Processing	69	27.0	32.1
Tate & Lyle PLC	Tate & Lyle	United Kingdom	Food and Beverage Processing	95	19.8	35.2
Mitsubishi Electric Corporation	Mitsubishi Group	Japan	Electrical Equipment and Machinery	63	27.4	28.1
MITSUBISHI ESTATE CO., LTD.	Mitsubishi Group	Japan	Real Estate	63	27.4	28.1
Nippon Yusen Kabushiki Kaisha	Mitsubishi Group	Japan	Water Transportation	63	27.4	28.1
AES Tietê	AES Corp.	Virginia, USA	Electric Utilities and Energy Related	35	9.8	31.3
Sappi Ltd.	Sappi	South Africa	Forest and Paper Products	60	9.5	27.4
SUEZ	Suez Environnement	France	Water Utilities	15	26.5	20.6
SUMITOMO CHEMICAL Co., Ltd.	Sumitomo Group	Japan	Chemicals	71	14.9	36.9
Sumitomo Electric Industries, Ltd.	Sumitomo Group	Japan	Automobiles and Components	71	14.9	36.9
Sumitomo Forestry Co., Ltd	Sumitomo Group	Japan	Homebuilding	71	14.9	36.9

The table lists companies that have adopted Science-Based Targets for greenhouse-gas reductions (as of December 18, 2020) that the US EPA Toxics Release Inventory and Risk Screening Environmental Indicators place among the top 100 companies for either air-pollutant RSEI risk or water-pollutant RSEI Hazard (out of 5,799 companies ranked for air releases and 3,253 companies ranked for water releases). The Environmental Justice shares for air report the percent share of the air-pollutant RSEI Risk from all company releases borne by nonwhite people or by people living below 200% of the US Federal Poverty Line. The Environmental Justice share for water report the water-pollutant RSEI Hazard-weighted population shares living within 10 miles of company-owned facilities. US population percent nonwhite is 37.2%. The US population percent living below 200% of the Federal Poverty Line is 28.9%.
Sources: Science Based Targets, US EPA, US Census, and PERI/CTIP Toxic 100.

Figure S-1: Map of eGRID Subregions