

This Page Left Intentionally Blank

Equity Analysis for Planned New Bus Maintenance Facility

I. Executive Summary

Prior to constructing new facilities, recipients of federal transportation funding must consider how the location of a proposed facility may impact the affected minority and low-income community. While the impacts of constructing and operating a facility need to be environmentally analyzed for potential impacts, the selection of the site location must also be scrutinized to ensure that the site was selected in a non-discriminatory manner.

As required by Title VI of Civil Rights Act of 1964, the RTA has conducted a Fixed Facility Equity Analysis intended to ensure that the location of the planned new Bus Maintenance Facility was selected without regard to race, color, or national origin. In addition, as required under Executive Order 12898 *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*, staff has completed a parallel review to ensure minority and low-income populations are not disproportionately affected by the selection of the preferred site.

Along with data and studies undertaken as part of the environmental review process, the RTA has determined that the selection of the proposed Bus Maintenance Facility site at 253 Elks Lane in San Luis Obispo would not result in a disparate impact to minority or low-income populations.

II. Background

TITLE VI AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE REQUIREMENTS

Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. As a recipient of federal funds, the RTA is required to conduct a Fixed Facility Equity Analysis, highlighted in both the federal Title VI guidance¹ and under Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulation² that is intended to ensure that the location is selected without regard to race, color, or national origin. This analysis must also “give attention to other facilities with similar impacts in the area to determine if any cumulative adverse impacts might result.”

In addition, Executive Order 12898³ *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations* requires DOT recipients to undertake analyses to ensure adverse impacts do not disproportionately impact minority and low-income communities. It should be stressed that disproportionately high and adverse effects, not

¹ FTA Circular C4702.1B

² Title 49 CFR Section 21.9(b)(3) and Appendix C, Section (3) (iv)

³ FTA Circular 4703.1

population size, are the bases for environmental justice. While the minority or low-income population in an area may be small, this does not eliminate the possibility of a disproportionately high and adverse effect of a proposed action. Although we present population size in a latter part of this report, the environmental reviews completed to identify and address impacts/mitigations under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) are an important element of this evaluation.

POLICIES

The RTA has developed policies and procedures to satisfy all requirements established by federal guidance under FTA Circulars C4702.1B and 4703.1. The RTA's policies were established so that no person would be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity provided by the RTA. The policies also provide for meaningful access to programs for persons with Limited English Proficiency (LEP). The RTA provides public notice of its policy to uphold and assure full compliance with Title VI on their agency website (<https://www.slorta.org/about-rta/civil-rights-information/#title>).

Information regarding the RTA's Title VI policies and the procedures for filing civil rights complaints are provided in English and Spanish.

PROJECT CONTEXT

The RTA is a Joint Powers Authority created by a Joint Powers Agreement with the County of San Luis Obispo, and the Cities of Arroyo Grande, Atascadero, Paso Robles, Grover Beach, Morro Bay, Pismo Beach, and San Luis Obispo. Pursuant to section 6500 et seq. of the California Government Code, a Joint Powers Authority is established when two or more public agencies by agreement jointly exercise any power common to the contracting agencies. The purpose of the Joint Powers Agreement is to enable the RTA to exercise the common powers of the member agencies to own, operate, and administer a county-wide public transportation system within the boundaries and over the territory within the jurisdiction of the Joint Powers Authority. Specifically, the RTA manages regional fixed route and paratransit services throughout San Luis Obispo County and is contracted by the County of San Luis Obispo and the City of Paso Robles to operate and provide services in the unincorporated areas and the Paso Express fixed route and Paso Robles Dial-A-Ride services. Five fixed-route services run throughout the region from as far north as San Miguel and San Simeon to as far south as Orcutt in Santa Barbara County.

In January 2015, the RTA completed the *Siting Analysis Report*, which provided a summary of the RTA's need for a long-term transit administration, operations, and maintenance facility. The report was intended to inform the RTA Board of Directors and the public, and for the RTA Board of Directors to provide RTA staff with direction, regarding the next steps to develop the project. The *Siting Analysis Report* includes a review of the RTA operations and system needs, and a brief review of several alternative sites considered for the facility.

As described in the *Siting Analysis Report* presented to the RTA Board of Directors at its January 7, 2015 meeting, the RTA has determined that the existing transit administration, operations, and maintenance facility in the City of San Luis Obispo will not support expansions in regional transit service and is inadequate to support existing services efficiently. The existing facility does not contain enough bus maintenance bays, sufficient storage space for batteries and tires, or any potential expansion space. The existing facility is also located at 179 Cross Street, several miles from the downtown San Luis Obispo transit center located at corner of Palm Street and Osos Street, resulting in increased travel costs and poor customer service (Refer to Figure 3). As detailed on page B-2-8 and explained in the *Siting Analysis Report*, RTA staff determined the necessary size (in square feet) of each functional area for the maintenance facility using the *Transit Garage Planning Guidelines* model (SG Associates, Inc. 1987). This information was then presented to the RTA Property Subcommittee, which was comprised of two elected Board of Directors members and supported by RTA staff and technical staff members from the City of San Luis Obispo.

SITE SELECTION CONSIDERATIONS

As detailed in the *Siting Analysis Report*, the site selected for development of a permanent operating base for the RTA should meet several criteria. The site should:

- Be located reasonably close to the points at which fixed route buses begin and end revenue service.
- Be large enough to support development of required facilities (about 6.0 acres gross area).
- Be reasonably level, so that extensive grading is not required.
- Have provision of communications, water, electric and sewer service, or access to same.
- Be free of hazardous wastes or be capable of remediation at low cost.
- Be in an area of compatible land uses (preferably industrial or commercial).

The first criterion – location with respect to the start and end points of revenue service – is necessary to minimize non-revenue (“deadhead”) vehicle-miles and vehicle-hours. It should be noted that deadhead operating costs occur daily for the life of the facility. Excess deadhead costs can become large over time and can affect the ability to provide service. The RTA route operations now and projected in the future are concentrated in the San Luis Obispo area, while park-outs will be provided in Paso Robles, Arroyo Grande and Cambria to meet local transportation needs. A facility site within or immediately adjacent to the San Luis Obispo urbanized area is therefore necessary, in order to minimize deadhead costs.

There are a number of factors indicating that the appropriate site is located in the southern portion of San Luis Obispo, or to the west of San Luis Obispo along State Route 1, for the following reasons:

- All of the parcels within or adjacent to the City of San Luis Obispo that are zoned Office, Service-Commercial or Manufacturing are located to the south, relatively close to the Airport.
- A parcel along State Route 1 between San Luis Obispo and Morro Bay might also be largely compatible with surrounding uses.
- While property costs tend to be lower the further one travels from San Luis Obispo city limits, deadhead costs would increase the further a facility is located from the downtown transit center located at Osos/Palm.
- In addition, travel time reliability also tends to decline the further one travels to/from downtown San Luis Obispo. This has been quantitatively demonstrated in the SLOCOG 2014 US-101 Mobility Study.

For these reasons, the search of potential sites was confined to southern/southeastern San Luis Obispo and to land near the County Corporation Yard at Kansas Street / State Route 1.

Potential Sites Examined

A list of potential sites to be examined was developed by RTA staff and reviewed by the RTA Property Subcommittee. The Subcommittee was originally formed during development of the *2006 SLOCOG Moving Toward the Efficiencies of Synergy: Operating Plan and Financial Analysis for a Coordinated Transit Maintenance and Dispatch Facility* report. The Subcommittee continued to meet when it became clear that the RTA's current 2.7 acre leased site at 179 Cross Street in San Luis Obispo would not meet long-term needs of the region.

A total of twelve sites were originally identified by the Subcommittee, and these candidate sites were then reviewed with local real estate professionals and Public Works staff from the city and county. The following eight sites in the City of San Luis Obispo were found to be potentially adequate for current service levels but too small for future planned service levels:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. 2950 Broad Street (3.3 acres) | 5. 4100 Vachell Street (2.6 acres) |
| 2. 3450 Broad Street (3.5 acres) | 6. 2923 & 3021 So. Higuera St. (2.7 acres) |
| 3. 2885 South Higuera Street (2.9 acres) | 7. Orcutt St. at Duncan St. (3.2 acres) |
| 4. 284 South Higuera Street (2.9 acres) | 8. 201 Bridge Street (3.4 acres) |

Based on those evaluations, the twelve original sites were narrowed down to four sites. All of the remaining four sites currently have proper zoning of either Public Facility, Manufacturing, or

Office. Only the Prado site is located in an identified 100-year floodplain. The four sites can be described as:

1. Kansas at State Route 1 in unincorporated San Luis Obispo County (6 acres)
2. 125 Venture Drive in the City of San Luis Obispo (9.3 acres)
3. 4880 Broad Street in the City of San Luis Obispo (5.7 acres)
4. 40 Prado Road in the City of San Luis Obispo (10 acres) – more recently referred to as 253 Elks Lane

Based on a number of factors presented in the *Site Consideration for a RTA Long-Term Garage Facility* document presented to the RTA Board of Directors in January 2015, the 40 Prado Road site was determined to be the most centrally located and economically feasible option that had the fewest impacts on residential areas and vulnerable populations. This document further explains the reasoning for selecting 40 Prado as the preferred site as it relates to impacts to minority and low-income occupants.

PUBLIC PROCESS ON SITE SELECTION

Before taking the site selection to the public, it was necessary to ensure that the site would be available, cost effective, and eligible to receive grant funds or loans for development. As a result, conducting aspects of the site development such as seeking funding, consulting with local planning agencies regarding the ability to construct on the site, and considering the impacts to minority and low-income communities has delayed engaging the public-at-large until it was clear that the site should be further considered. Along with the analysis of adverse impacts to minority residents and businesses, as well as low-income populations, the public engagement process set the stage for environmental clearance.

ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE TIMELINE AND/OR ACTIVITIES

The preferred site at 40 Prado is associated with an Initial Study Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) report that was certified by the RTA Board of Directors in September 2017. Additional technical studies are currently being undertaken to document conditions and related data that has changed since the date the original IS/MND was certified, resulting in reduced impacts. More specifically, the RTA has reduced the building size and eliminated two core functions originally identified in the IS/MND (on-site liquid fueling and automated bus wash system). As such, the IS/MND is currently undergoing amendments that will be incorporated into amended state (CEQA) and federal (NEPA) environmental review documents in summer 2019.

III. Project Description

The September 2017 IS/MND report envisioned construction of an approximately 45,000 square-foot, two-story combined administration headquarters and bus maintenance building on the eastern portion of the approximately 6.5 acre project site. However, after further master

planning and preliminary engineering efforts, in March 2019 the building has been reduced from two stories to one, equating to roughly 29,000 square feet. As such, all three functions – administration, bus operations and maintenance – will all be located on one floor, and will include maintenance bays, large- and small-parts storage, clean-room workspace (for high-tech components servicing), offices, a conference room, and employee restrooms, showers, and lockers. The remainder of the project site would be developed for outdoor circulation, storage, servicing, and inspection. The proposed on-site parking would accommodate approximately 67 public transit buses and vans as well as 84 employee and visitor vehicles. In total the developed area proposed for the project remains approximately 4.2 acres. The remaining 2.3 acres is anticipated to be used for the future Prado Road overpass and Elks Lane re-alignment. Construction of the project would require development of the proposed building to withstand a 100-year flood level event.

PREFERRED SITE LOCATION

As described in the September 2017 IS/MND report, the project site is a 6.5-acre parcel (Assessor's Parcel Number [APN] 053-041-071), located at 253 Elks Lane adjacent to the intersection of Elks Lane and Prado Road, in the City of San Luis Obispo, California. The site is regionally accessible from United States Highway 101 (U.S. 101) which runs in the north-south direction, parallel to Elks Lane, west of the site. The project site is within the floodplain of San Luis Obispo Creek located to the east of the site.

The site is currently occupied by a small U-Haul facility, including a building and parking lot, in the southwest corner of the site. The remainder of the property is vacant with scattered ruderal vegetation and most recently used as a leased employee parking/carpool/vanpool center for a distant multi-year construction project. Thus, most of the site was graded and paved for a parking and transportation use. One high-voltage electric power transmission tower is located near the center of the site.

The project site parcel is designated Office in the City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Land Use Element. The site is also located within the General Plan's Sunset Drive-In Theater/Prado Road Area Special Focus Area. According to the City's Zoning Map, the project site is zoned Office with a Planned Development overlay (O-PD). The project site is also located in the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport Land Use Plan Safety Area S-1b, which has been substituted by City overrule for the requirements of the Airport Overlay Zone which are outlined in Chapter 17.57 of the City's Zoning Regulations (Zoning Regulations Section 17.22.010.B).

Existing uses surrounding the site include the following:

West: Elks Lane and U.S. 101, which run in the north-south direction parallel to Elks Lane, are located to the west of the project site. The U.S. 101 northbound on-ramp from Prado Road is located near the southwest corner of the site and runs parallel to the western boundary of the site connecting Prado Road to U.S. 101. Beyond U.S. 101 are a variety of commercial uses zoned Commercial Retail with a Planned Development overlay (C-R-PD).

North: The Sunset Drive-In Theater is located north of the project site with a mobile home park and the San Luis Cemetery (also known as the International Order of Odd Fellows and Lawn Cemeteries) beyond. This area has a General Plan designation of Community Commercial and is zoned Community-Commercial with a Special Focus overlay (C-C-SF).

East: To the east of the project site is the recently completed Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo (CAPSLO) Homeless Services Center. Next to this lot is a storage yard with three existing structures. Two residential structures are located at the east end of the storage yard. A bus stop is planned for the area adjacent to the CAPSLO Homeless Services Center to be served primarily by the municipal transit operator (SLO Transit). The area is zoned Office with a Special Focus overlay (O-SF).

South: The City of San Luis Obispo's corporation yard, which includes the Water Reclamation and Resources Facility (WRRF), is located across Prado Road, directly south of the project site, in the Public Facility (PF) zone. The SLO Transit (local fixed route system) bus maintenance facility is also located within the City's corporation yard. The U.S. 101 northbound off-ramp to Prado Road extends from U.S. 101 in the north-south direction parallel to western boundary of the City's corporation yard property.

IV. Site Selection Process

The RTA closely followed its Environmental Evaluation Policy to complete the CEQA IS/MND Report. The Policy was adopted by the RTA Board of Directors at its May 4, 2016 meeting. While the Policy primarily focuses on environmental reviews required under CEQA, it also provides direction to staff when developing environmental reviews required under the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), including requests for Categorical Exclusions (CE) such as the one submitted to the Federal Transit Administration for the Bus Maintenance Facility on September 7, 2017. The Policy identifies public outreach and agency coordination steps, including coordinating input through the State Clearinghouse agency outreach process, County Clerk notification responsibilities, and other outreach requirements.

A draft copy of the CE request and of the draft CEQA IS/MND Report were presented to the RTA Board at its July 12, 2017 meeting. At that meeting, the RTA Board directed staff to open the minimum 30-day public comment period, and to schedule a September 6, 2017 public hearing to consider certifying the CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration finding. The RTA published notice of the public hearing in The Tribune newspaper on August 23, 2017; this publication has the highest circulation in the county. Working with SLO City Planning Department officials, we sent notification of the public hearing via postcards to persons living within 1,000 feet of the property. Finally, notice of the public hearing was posted at the project site, on our website and on the LCD information screens inside each RTA bus. The State Clearinghouse assigned our project SCH number 2017071040, and the public comment period was officially recognized from July 20, 2017 through August 18, 2017. As detailed in an August 21, 2017 letter from Scott

Morgan, Director of the State Clearinghouse, no comments were submitted by any of the responding agencies through the State Clearinghouse process.

The RTA Board conducted a public hearing on September 6, 2107. Staff provided a summary of public agency and citizen input received, as well as a list of slight language and graphics revisions that were included in the final CEQA IS/MND Report. No persons provided oral or written testimony during the Public Hearing. The RTA Board of Directors voted 11 to 0 in favor of:

1. Certifying the CEQA finding,
2. Authorizing the RTA Executive Director to submit the NEPA Categorical Exclusion request letter, and
3. Authorizing the RTA Executive Director to solicit proposals for design/engineering services for the RTA Bus Maintenance Facility Project.

The RTA publicized the final/amended CEQA IS/MND Report with the County Clerk for 30 days, which completed our CEQA obligations per State law. The County Clerk notice also referenced the fact that the final CEQA Report is posted on our website.

SITE SELECTION GOALS AND RESULTS

In January 2015, the RTA Board accepted the *Siting Analysis Report*, which included evaluations of site functionality, site efficiency and site development. The RTA then competitively procured Environmental Planning Services in February 2016, led by a team from Rincon Consultants to develop the CEQA and NEPA reports. Over the ensuing 15 months, the RTA worked with our consultants, public agency representatives and adjoining neighbors to evaluate any potential impacts of the proposed project. In particular, we worked closely with City of SLO, SLO County Air Pollution Control District, County Regional Airport, and Tribal representatives. A total of fifteen mitigation measures were identified to avoid impacts during preconstruction (four measures), construction (ten measures) and post-construction/operations (one measure). None of the impacts of the new facility would result in avoidable discriminatory impacts based on race, color, or national origin, nor disproportionate impacts on low-income populations.

The goals below include the evaluative measures within each CEQA category. The 40 Prado location (Census Tract Block Group 111.03-2) was selected as the preferred site based on how well it performed against the goals developed by the Property Subcommittee and presented in the *Siting Analysis Report*; the other three alternative site were evaluated but ultimately rejected.

V. Analysis of Adverse Impacts & Effects on Minority and Low-Income Populations

As referenced in the September 2017 IS/MND, the preferred 40 Prado location has been analyzed for impacts in the following 18 areas required under CEQA:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Aesthetics | 10. Land Use Planning |
| 2. Agricultural & Forest Resources | 11. Mineral Resources |
| 3. Air Quality | 12. Noise |
| 4. Biological Resources | 13. Population & Housing |
| 5. Cultural Resources | 14. Public Services |
| 6. Geology & Soils | 15. Transportation |
| 7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions | 16. Tribal Cultural Resources |
| 8. Hazards & Hazardous Materials | 17. Utility & Service Systems |
| 9. Hydrology & Water Quality | 18. Mandatory Findings of Significance |

In addition, the RTA conducted a parallel evaluation of impacts as they relate to areas covered under NEPA. Following certification of the IS/MND, the RTA submitted a request for a Categorical Exclusion (CE) to the FTA Region 9 office on September 7, 2017. The FTA provided a concurrence letter on September 29, 2017. The CE letter details the analysis of potential impacts in the following 16 areas required under NEPA:

1. Metropolitan Planning & Air Quality Conformity
2. Land Use & Zoning
3. Traffic & Parking Impacts
4. Carbon Monoxide, PM2.5 and PM10 Hot Spots
5. Historic & Cultural Resource Impacts
6. Noise & Vibration Impacts
7. Acquisitions & Relocations
8. Hazardous Materials
9. Community Disruption & Environmental Justice Analysis
10. Use of 4(f) Resources
11. Impacts on Wetlands
12. Floodplain Impacts
13. Impacts on Water Quality, Navigable Waterways, and Coastal Zones
14. Impacts on Ecologically-Sensitive Areas & Endangered Species
15. Impacts on Safety & Security
16. Impacts Caused by Construction

The conclusion under both CEQA and NEPA analyses is that the proposed project will have a less-than-significant impact that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The IS/MND commits the RTA to implement a range of Preconstruction, Construction, and Post-Construction/Operations mitigations to ensure any

adverse impacts are addressed. Although some construction noise and vibration may occur during daylight hours, overall impacts associated with operation of the project on the site would remain similar to current conditions and consistent with the planned use at the site.

For the purposes of environmental justice analysis, federal agencies are required to identify whether a proposed project will possibly have disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority or low-income populations within the proposed project vicinity. The proposed project vicinity, or the affected environment for the environmental justice analysis, consists of the proposed project site and adjacent census blocks. For the purposes on this analysis, an impact is considered to be significant and require mitigation if it would result in any of the following:

Impact 1. Substantially affect employment, industry, or commerce, including requiring the displacement of businesses or farms;

Impact 2. Substantially affect property values or the local tax base;

Impact 3. Substantially, disproportionately affect minority, low-income, elderly, disabled, transit-dependent, or other specific interest group(s); or

Impact 4. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Based on all four of these impact areas, the proposed project will not result in any adverse socioeconomic and environmental justice effects. Additionally, the proposed project would have a beneficial effect to the minority communities in the project vicinity by providing additional employment opportunities.

METHODOLOGY AND DATA USE

Although the project is deemed to have no significant adverse impact to the environment, it is important to further determine if any of the less-than-significant impacts identified in the IS/MND report would disproportionately impact minority or low-income populations near the preferred site. To determine the presence of minority and low-income populations near the four alternative sites, we compiled information at both the 2010 U.S. Census block group level and the 2017 American Community Survey census tract level. A **block group** is a cluster of census blocks, and generally have populations between 600 and 3,000 people; a **census tract** is a cluster of block groups with populations generally between 1,500 and 8,000 people. However, if too few sample cases are reported at the block group level, then that data is not available. This was the case when attempting to evaluate populations living below poverty at the block group level. So all of the data presented for the four alternative sites reflects census tract information; we also present statewide, county and city data for comparison.

Using mapping software, a 1000-foot buffer was drawn around each alternative site that was considered to determine each potentially impacted census tract. Residents falling within the

buffer were included for analysis. While 1000-feet may appear to be a fairly large area, it represents a conservative approach to analysis, as it identifies potential impact areas that may be greater than actually would be impacted. The reader will remember that postcards were sent to all persons living within 1,000 feet during the IS/MND public comment period. No input was received from persons identifying as low-income, although we worked directly with Tribal interests to identify how to mitigate cultural resources that might be discovered during ground-disturbing activities. No other input was received from communities identifying as a minority population.

As shown in Table 2 below, the population in poverty in the census tract that includes the preferred site at 40 Prado (15.6%) is well below the entire City of San Luis Obispo (32.4%), although it is slightly higher than the countywide proportion (13.8%). The proportion is roughly the same as the statewide average (15.1%).

The minority population percentages of three of the four alternative site locations are higher than either the City or the County of San Luis Obispo as a whole, although the proportion of all four sites are well below the statewide average.

Location	Population in Poverty	Poverty Percentage	Minority Population	Minority Percentage
<i>Preferred Site: 40 Prado</i> (Census Tract 113.02)	436	15.6%	407	27.9%
Alt Sites 1 & 2: 125 Venture Dr & 4880 Broad (Census Tract 115.03)	400	11.0%	340	15.3%
Alt Site 3: Kansas @ SR-1 (Census Tract 115.04)	38	5.2%	395	29.8%
City of San Luis Obispo	14,899	32.4%	7,180	15.3%
County of San Luis Obispo	36,420	13.8%	39,535	14.1%
State of California	5,773,408	15.1%	15,375,605	39.4%

Source: 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

To get a better understanding of minority communities in the area that includes the preferred 40 Prado site, staff evaluated race at the much more detailed 2010 Census block group level. We discovered a relatively high proportion of Hispanic or Latino residents live near the preferred 40 Prado site: 23.0% in Census Tract 111.03 Block Group 2. In comparison, 14.7% of City residents and 20.8% of County resident reported their race as Hispanic or Latino. The statewide average is much higher at 37.6%. Staff mailed a copy of this analysis to the Promotores Collaborative on June 27, 2019 and invited representatives to provide comments in writing or in-person at the July 10th public hearing.

VI. Conclusions

In accordance with both federal and state environmental law and federal guidance, the RTA has conducted focused environmental impact evaluations for the proposed Bus Maintenance Facility Project. This has included both technical studies and analyses associated with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA),

as well as a qualitative site selection evaluation and public review that is required by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Based upon the analyses conducted, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to the environment. Additionally, based on the qualitative site selection evaluation and public review of the proposed sites, the site was chosen without regard to race, color or national origin, nor are low-income communities disproportionately impacted.