4.0 OTHER MAJOR AREAS OF CONCERN

4.1 CSLC ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE POLICY

Environmental justice is defined by California law as “the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies” (Senate Bill 115 [Chapter 690, Statutes of 1999]). This definition is consistent with the Public Trust Doctrine principle that the management of trust lands is for the benefit of all of the people. The California State Lands Commission (CSLC) adopted an environmental justice policy in 2002 to ensure that environmental justice is an essential consideration in the agency’s processes, decisions, and programs. Through its policy, CSLC reaffirms its commitment to an informed and open process in which all people are treated equitably and with dignity, and in which its decisions are tempered by environmental justice considerations. As part of this policy, the CSLC continues and enhances its processes, decisions, and programs with environmental justice as an essential consideration by:

1) Identifying relevant populations that might be adversely affected by CSLC programs or by projects submitted by outside parties for its consideration.

2) Seeking out community groups and leaders to encourage communication and collaboration with the CSLC and its staff.

3) Distributing public information as broadly as possible and in multiple languages, as needed, to encourage participation in the CSLC’s public processes.

4) Incorporating consultations with affected community groups and leaders while preparing environmental analyses of projects submitted to the CSLC for its consideration.

5) Ensuring that public documents and notices relating to human health or environmental issues are concise, understandable, and readily accessible to the public, in multiple languages, as needed.

6) Holding public meetings, public hearings, and public workshops at times and in locations that encourage meaningful public involvement by members of the affected communities.

7) Educating present and future generations in all walks of life about public access to lands and resources managed by the CSLC.

8) Ensuring that a range of reasonable alternatives is identified when siting facilities that may adversely affect relevant populations and identifying, for the CSLC’s consideration, those that would minimize or eliminate environmental impacts affecting such populations.
9) Working in conjunction with Federal, State, regional, and local agencies to ensure consideration of disproportionate impacts on relevant populations, by instant or cumulative environmental pollution or degradation.

10) Fostering research and data collection to better define cumulative sources of pollution, exposures, risks, and impacts.

11) Providing appropriate training on environmental justice issues to staff and the CSLC so that recognition and consideration of such issues are incorporated into its daily activities.

12) Reporting periodically to the CSLC on how environmental justice is a part of the programs, processes, and activities conducted by the CSLC and by proposing modifications as necessary.

4.1.1 Methodology

The CSLC environmental justice policy does not specify a methodology for conducting programmatic-level analysis of environmental justice issues. This analysis focuses primarily on whether the Project’s impacts have the potential to affect areas of high-minority populations and/or low-income communities disproportionately and thus would create an adverse environmental justice effect. For the purpose of the environmental analysis, the Project’s inconsistency with the CSLC’s Environmental Justice Policy would occur if the Project would:

- Have the potential to disproportionately affect minority and/or low-income populations adversely; or
- Result in a substantial, disproportionate decrease in employment and economic base of minority and/or low-income populations residing in immediately adjacent communities.

4.1.2 Project Analysis

4.1.2.1 Communities of Concern Identified within the Project Study Area

Project removal and abandonment activities are located primarily across the San Joaquin River crossing between the City of Oakley (City) in Contra Costa County and levee at Sherman Island in southern Sacramento County. Onshore and offshore work crews would be required. Onshore personnel would access the southern landing and valve pit at the Lauritzen Yacht Harbor located in the City in Contra Costa County. The northern landing would be accessed via State Route (SR) 160 (Antioch Bridge) to Sherman Island in southern Sacramento County. Offshore crews would likely access the Project site from Mare Island located approximately 30 miles west of the Project site. As such, demographics for the onshore communities of the City, Contra Costa County, and Sacramento County have been included and discussed herein.
4.1.2.2 Environmental Setting

Demographics

As indicated in Table 4-1, a summary of the regional demography within the Project onshore potentially affected areas shows that the City contains a smaller percentage of minority persons compared to total population (24.6 %) than in Contra Costa County (34.6%) or Sacramento County (36%). One feature of the U.S. Census data is important to note because it complicates the environmental justice analysis. Hispanic and Latino persons are considered as minority persons, consistent with federal and State environmental justice policies. However, as characterized in the census data, Hispanic or Latino persons may also belong to any race (i.e., White, Black, Native American, or any other racial category). Because an unspecified percentage of Hispanic or Latino persons identify themselves as White, the census data do not include members of that group in the category of “ethnic minorities.” As a result, for a given population, the total percentage of persons belonging to “ethnic minorities” (as defined by census data) underestimates the actual percentage of minority community members. Since Hispanic and Latino persons represent a substantial portion of the minority communities in some parts of the onshore Project area considered, the percentage of each area’s population identifying themselves as Hispanic or Latino is summarized separately below.

Although the City contains a smaller percentage of minority persons than Contra Costa or Sacramento Counties as a whole, a larger percentage of persons within the total population within the City identify themselves as being persons of Hispanic or Latino origin (25 %) than that identified for Contra Costa or Sacramento Counties (16-17.7 %). However, although Hispanic and Latino persons are also considered within the minority population, in this instance, the percentage of Hispanic and Latino persons for the City (25 %) is consistent with the percentage of minorities for the City (24.6 %).

Socioeconomics

As shown in Table 4-2 below, socioeconomic statistics regarding income and poverty levels from the onshore potentially affected areas, as estimated by the U.S. Census Bureau, are varied. Sacramento County has the lowest median family income levels ($50,717) and highest percentage of individuals (14.1 %) and families (10.3 %) living below the established poverty level. In comparison, Contra Costa County has a higher median family income level ($73,039) and moderate percentage of individuals (7.6 %) and families (5.4 %) living below the poverty level. The City has a median family income level of $68,888 and a lower percentage of individuals (5 %) and families (2.8 %) living below the poverty level.
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Table 4-1. U.S. Census Regional Demographic Comparison Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/City</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>American Indian and Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Two Or More Races</th>
<th>Some Other Race</th>
<th>Approx. % of Minority Population</th>
<th>Persons of Hispanic or Latino Origin (from Total Population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>1,223,449</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>948,816</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley</td>
<td>25,619</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4-2. Socioeconomic Comparison of Affected Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/City</th>
<th>Per Capita Income</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Median Family Income</th>
<th>Percentage of Individuals below Poverty Level</th>
<th>Percentage of Families Below Poverty Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>$21,142</td>
<td>$43,816</td>
<td>$50,717</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>$30,615</td>
<td>$63,675</td>
<td>$73,039</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley</td>
<td>$21,895</td>
<td>$65,589</td>
<td>$68,888</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1 4.1.3 Impact Analysis

2 4.1.3.1 Northern Landing at Sherman Island (Sacramento County)

3 Pipelines and the existing subterranean valve pit would be removed 15 feet north of the toe of the Sherman Island levee at the northern landing (levee) at Sherman Island. This area is currently open space that is partially zoned for agricultural development. The closest residential development is within the City to the south. Access to this area during construction would be via SR 160 (Antioch Bridge). During construction, personnel required for onshore work may temporarily reside within the City as discussed below (Southern Landing).

4 Following completion of construction, the Project area would be return to pre-Project conditions. The area would be backfilled with native materials and restored in accordance with Central Valley Flood Protection Board/ Reclamation District 341 standards. As discussed in Section 3.2, Agricultural Resources, no impacts to exiting agricultural operations would result. Additionally, although Sacramento County
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4.1.3.2 Southern Landing at the Lauritzen Yacht Harbor (City, Contra Costa County)

Pipelines within the southern landing would be abandoned in-place within an existing subterranean valve pit located within the Lauritzen Yacht Harbor. The existing valve pit is located within a cleared dirt area adjacent to the dock and slips. Construction activities at this location may cause a temporary impediment to traffic flow within this immediate area; however, this inconvenience would not affect minority or low-income populations. During construction, personnel required for onshore work may temporarily reside within the City area. The addition of these crew members for up to 3 months would contribute to a slight increase in housing demand and local traffic within the respective local roadway systems and communities. However, impacts are not anticipated as this area does not contain a high percentage (approximately 24.6%) of minority or low-income (5%) persons. No disproportionate impact to environmental justice communities would result.

4.1.3.3 Offshore Vessel Mobilization and Pipeline Removal Across San Joaquin River

Initial offshore vessel mobilization would likely be from the Mare Island located within an industrially developed area located approximately 30 miles west of the Project site. Vessels would mobilize east along the San Joaquin River to the offshore Project corridor east of SR 160 (Antioch Bridge). Once on-station, the primary vessel (barge) and support vessels would remain moored offshore for the duration of removal activities (approximately 3 months). During this time, offshore pipeline removal activities may be observed by travelers along SR 160 (Antioch Bridge), other commercial or recreational boaters transiting through this area, and adjacent development at the shoreline of the City or Sherman Island.

As discussed in Section 3.16, Transportation, offshore construction activities would temporarily increase offshore vessel traffic and congestion. However, as this waterway is commonly used in support of local industry, the addition of these few vessels and the transitory 500-foot preclusion area for safety purpose required for pipeline removal activities for approximately 3 months would not generate a significant increase in vessel traffic or congestion. No commercial fishing is located within this area. Recreational boaters or fisherman would have other areas of opportunity to pursue their activities. Offshore vessel traffic and anchoring would remain in accordance with existing uses through noticing (MM TRANS-1: Local Notice to Mariners), for use of established...
vessel traffic corridors, and an approved anchoring plan would be developed in accordance with USCG standards (MM HAZ-2 Marine Safety and Anchoring Plan).

Expenditures during construction would be limited to equipment rental and food and lodging for construction personnel, and would typically stay in the local economy. Offshore support crew personnel may require several days of hotel stay for workers; however, the small increase in number of construction workers during offshore pipeline removal activities would not displace any residences, and would not necessitate construction of additional housing. As such, short-term socioeconomic effects of offshore construction are expected to be minimal and no disproportionate impact to minority and low-income populations would result.

4.1.4 Mitigation Summary

The Project would not result in significant impacts to environmental justice populations; therefore, no mitigation is required. Although there are no impacts resulting from the proposed Project, the following MMs would further reduce the potential for impacts to environmental justice populations:

- MM TRANS-1: Local Notice to Mariners.