

5.3 SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, AND CHILDREN'S ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SAFETY RISKS

This section assesses the potential socioeconomic impacts, environmental justice impacts, and children's environmental health and safety risks that would occur as a result of implementing the Sponsor's Proposed Project or its alternatives.

5.3.1 SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS

Socioeconomic impacts are assessed to determine the effect that the proposed airport development would have on the social and economic fabric of the surrounding communities. The types of socioeconomic impacts that typically arise from airport development are:

- Extensive relocation of residents without the availability of sufficient replacement housing;
- Extensive relocation of community businesses that would create severe economic hardship for the affected communities;
- Disruptions of local traffic patterns that would substantially reduce the levels of service of the roads serving Gness Field Airport (DVO or Airport) and its surrounding communities; and
- A substantial loss in community tax base.

5.3.1.1 Future Conditions: 2018

The following section analyzes the impacts that the Sponsor's Proposed Project and its alternatives would have with respect to the above factors.

Alternative A: No Action

Relocation of Residences: Alternative A would not result in the acquisition or the conversion of residential properties to Airport property. Therefore, no impacts to socioeconomic resources would occur as a result of relocation of residences.

Relocation of Businesses: Alternative A would not result in impacts to businesses located on or off-Airport. Therefore, no impacts to socioeconomic resources would occur as a result of relocation of businesses.

Disruptions of Local Traffic Patterns: Alternative A would not result in modifications to off-Airport roadways or increase surface traffic. Therefore, no impacts to socioeconomic resources would occur as a result of disruptions of local traffic patterns.

Substantial Loss in Community Tax Base: Alternative A would not result in a substantial loss in community tax base. Therefore, no impacts to socioeconomic resources would occur as a result.

Implementation of Alternative A would not have a significant impact on socioeconomic resources.

**Alternative B:
Extend Runway 13/31 to the Northwest by 1,100 feet (Sponsor's Proposed Project)**

Relocation of Residences: The construction and implementation of the Sponsor's Proposed Project would not result in the acquisition or the conversion of residential properties to Airport property. Therefore, no impacts to socioeconomic resources would occur as a result of relocation of residences.

Relocation of Businesses: The construction and implementation of the Sponsor's Proposed Project would not result in impacts to businesses located on or off-Airport property. Therefore, no impacts to socioeconomic resources would occur as a result of relocation of businesses.

Disruptions of Local Traffic Patterns: The construction and implementation of the Sponsor's Proposed Project does not include proposed modifications to off-Airport roadways. The Sponsor's Proposed Project would not result in an increase in surface traffic other than a temporary increase during construction. Based on the estimates prepared for construction, it is anticipated that the Sponsor's Proposed Project would add up to 33 vehicles (mainly trucks) a day to the local roadways, with the average over the 18-month construction period being approximately 20 vehicles a day. Depending on the origin and destination of the vehicles, roadways likely to be used would include Atherton Road, Highway 101 north and south, Airport Road, and Binford Road. Being the primary access point to the Airport, Airport Road and Binford Road would receive all of these vehicles, while the other roadways would receive some portion. Given the relatively low levels of traffic on Airport Road and Binford Road, it is concluded that they are sufficient enough to handle this temporary increase during construction. The other roadways in the area are physically capable of handling the additional vehicles and the number of vehicles would be relatively small compared to the existing level of traffic on these roads. Therefore, there would be no significant disruption of local traffic patterns as a result of implementing the Sponsor's Proposed Project.

Substantial Loss in Community Tax Base: As noted in the preceding sections, the implementation of the Sponsor's Proposed Project would not result in the relocation of any residences or local businesses. However, the Sponsor's Proposed Project would require the acquisition of property.

The Sponsor's Proposed Project would require acquisition of 0.1 acre of land to the southeast of the runway for the extension of the runway safety area to the south. This property is part of a 37-acre parcel that is located immediately off the southern end of the runway. The parcel is owned by JHW Family Limited Partners¹, but due to an existing easement that Marin County holds on the property, the height of any structures can be restricted so that it would not become a hazard to navigation.² For the area being discussed, the maximum vertical height would be less than two feet, making it impossible to construct buildings. For tax purposes, the value of the 37 acre parcel is estimated to be \$483,253 and the portion of the parcel to be acquired is estimated to be valued at \$915. The loss in tax revenue would be approximately \$10.43 annually. This loss in tax revenue would not be considered substantial. Therefore the Sponsor's Proposed Project would not significantly affect the local tax base for Marin County. In addition, Marin County intends to keep the Airport open for business during construction of the proposed runway extension. As a result, no loss of revenue for the airport-related businesses is anticipated.

Implementation of Alternative B would not have a significant impact on socioeconomic resources.

**Alternative D:
Extend Runway 13/31 to the Southeast by 240 feet and to the Northwest
by 860 feet**

Relocation of Residences: The construction and implementation of Alternative D would not result in the acquisition or the conversion of residential properties to Airport property. Therefore, no impacts to socioeconomic resources would occur as a result of relocation of residences.

Relocation of Businesses: The construction and implementation of Alternative D would not result in impacts to businesses located on or off-Airport. Therefore, no impacts to socioeconomic resources would occur as a result of relocation of businesses.

Disruptions of Local Traffic Patterns: The construction and implementation of Alternative D does not include proposed modifications to off-Airport roadways. Alternative D would not result in an increase in surface traffic other than a temporary increase during construction. Based on the estimates prepared for construction, it is anticipated that Alternative D would add up to 33 vehicles (mainly trucks) a day to the local roadways, with the average over the 18-month construction period being approximately 20 vehicles a day. Depending on the origin and destination of the vehicles, roadways likely to be used would include Atherton Road, Highway 101 north and south, Airport Road, and Binford Road. Being the primary access point to the Airport, Airport Road and Binford Road would receive all of these vehicles, while the other roadways would receive some portion. Given the relatively low levels of traffic on Airport Road and Binford Road, it is concluded that they are sufficient enough to handle this temporary increase during

¹ Marin County Assessor-Recorder - Property Inquiry Details, accessed online at <http://www.co.marin.ca.us/depts/ar/COMPASS/index.asp> on October 8, 2013.

² Avigation Easement between Rancho Del Pantano, Inc. and Marin County, April 10, 1967.

construction. The other roadways in the area are physically capable of handling the additional vehicles and the number of vehicles would be relatively small compared to the existing level of traffic on these roads. Therefore, there would be no significant disruption of local traffic patterns as a result of implementing Alternative D.

Substantial Loss in Community Tax Base: As noted in the preceding sections, the implementation of Alternative D would not result in the relocation of any residences or local businesses. However, Alternative D would require the acquisition of property.

Alternative D would require the acquisition of 3.7 acres of land to the southeast of the runway for the extension of the runway and runway safety area to the south. This property is part of a 37 acre parcel that is located immediately off the southern end of the runway. The parcel is owned by JHW Family Limited Partners, but due to an existing easement that Marin County holds on the property, the height of any structures can be restricted so that it would not become a hazard to navigation.³ For the area being discussed, the maximum vertical height would be less than ten feet, making it virtually impossible to construct buildings with any useful purpose. For tax purposes, the value of the 37 acre parcel is estimated to be \$483,253 and the portion of the parcel to be acquired is estimated to be valued at \$48,325. The loss in tax revenue would be approximately \$551.10 annually. This loss in tax revenue would not be considered substantial. Therefore Alternative D would not significantly affect the local tax base for Marin County.

Implementation of Alternative D would not have a significant impact on socioeconomic resources.

5.3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations*, requires all Federal agencies to address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations. The Executive Order also directs Federal agencies to incorporate environmental justice as part of their overall mission by conducting their programs and activities in a manner that provides minority and low-income populations an opportunity to participate in agency programs and activities.

³ Avigation Easement between Rancho Del Pantano, Inc. and Marin County, April 10, 1967.

The U.S. Department of Transportation Order 5610.2(a) provides definitions for minority and low income populations:

- a. Low-Income means a person whose median household income is at or below the Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines.
- b. Minority means a person who is:
 - (1) Black: a person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa;
 - (2) Hispanic or Latino: a person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race;
 - (3) Asian American: a person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent;
 - (4) American Indian and Alaskan Native: a person having origins in any of the original people of North America, South America (including Central America), and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition; or
 - (5) Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander: people having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.
- c. Low-Income Population means any readily identifiable group of low-income persons who live in geographic proximity, and, if circumstances warrant, geographically dispersed/transient persons (such as migrant workers or Native Americans) who will be similarly affected by a proposed DOT program, policy or activity.
- d. Minority Population means any readily identifiable groups of minority persons who live in geographic proximity, and if circumstances warrant, geographically dispersed/transient persons (such as migrant workers or Native Americans) who will be similarly affected by a proposed DOT program, policy or activity.

The Executive Order relates to requirements in Title VI of the *Civil Rights Act of 1964* (Title VI), the *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA), the *Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act* (Title 49 CFR Part 24), and other applicable statutes and regulations. Title VI provides that no person will, on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, marital status, disability, or family composition, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subject to discrimination under any program of the Federal, state, or local government. Title VIII of the *1968 Civil Rights Act* guarantees each person equal opportunity in housing.

FAA Order 1050.1E, Change 1, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*, provides guidance for the preparation of environmental justice analysis in support of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Section 16.2a (1) of Appendix A of the Order states that EISs should discuss the significant impact that a project would

cause, then identify affected populations. If a significant impact would affect low income or minority populations at a disproportionately higher level than it would other population segments, an environmental justice issue is likely.

FAA Order 1050.1E, Change 1, Section 16.1a of Appendix A, states that environmental justice is examined during evaluation of other impact categories such as noise, air quality, water, hazardous materials, and cultural resources. In order to determine if there is a potential for significant impacts to low income or minority populations, a review of all impact categories was conducted. There are no significant impacts to any of the impact categories that cannot be mitigated. Therefore, with implementation of the compensatory mitigation measures identified in this EIS it is concluded that neither the Sponsor's Proposed Project nor its alternatives would disproportionately impact any low income or minority populations.

5.3.3 CHILDREN'S ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SAFETY RISKS

Executive Order 13045, *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*, requires all Federal agencies to make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children; and shall ensure that its policies, programs, activities, and standards address disproportionate risks to children that result from environmental health risks or safety risks.

Based on a review of available data conducted as part of this EIS, implementation of the Sponsor's Proposed Project or its alternatives would not result in an elevated risk related to health or safety concerns for children. Typically, the primary children's health concern is asthma and related lung disorders. In order to determine whether the Proposed Project or its alternatives would increase the likelihood of children contracting these health problems, the analysis conducted in Section 5.5, *Air Quality*, was examined. According to the analysis in Section 5.5, none of the alternatives would create air quality conditions that would worsen breathing conditions for children. Based on the analyses detailed in Section 5.6, *Water Quality*, none of the alternatives would result in the release of harmful agents into surface or groundwater resources above levels permitted by the State of California and Federal regulations.

Based on the analyses conducted in this EIS, neither the Sponsor's Proposed Project nor its alternatives would result in the release of, or exposure to, significant levels of harmful agents in the water, air, or soil that would affect children's health or safety.