

MILLENNIUM BULK TERMINALS—LONGVIEW SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

SEPA SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY RESOURCES TECHNICAL REPORT

PREPARED FOR:

Cowlitz County
207 4th Avenue North
Kelso, WA 98626
Contact: Elaine Placido, Director of Building and Planning

IN COOPERATION WITH:

Washington State Department of Ecology, Southwest Region

PREPARED BY:

ICF
710 Second Avenue, Suite 550
Seattle, WA 98104

BergerABAM
210 East 13th Street, Suite 300
Vancouver, WA 98660

April 2017



ICF and BergerABAM. 2017. *Millennium Bulk Terminals—Longview, SEPA Environmental Impact Statement, SEPA Social and Community Resources Technical Report*. April. (ICF 00264.13.) Seattle, WA. Prepared for Cowlitz County, Kelso, WA, in cooperation with Washington State Department of Ecology, Southwest Region.

Contents

List of Tables	ii
List of Figures.....	ii
List of Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	iii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1-1
1.1 Project Description	1-1
1.2 Regulatory Setting	1-6
1.3 Study Areas.....	1-7
Chapter 2 Existing Conditions	2-1
2.1 Methods	2-1
2.1.1 Data Sources	2-1
2.1.2 Impact Analysis	2-1
2.2 Existing Conditions	2-4
2.2.1 Social/Community Cohesion and Public Services	2-4
2.2.2 Minority and Low-Income Populations	2-17
2.2.3 Utilities	2-21
Chapter 3 Impacts	3-1
3.1 Proposed Action	3-1
3.1.1 Social/Community Cohesion and Public Services	3-1
3.1.2 Minority and Low-Income Populations	3-4
3.1.3 Utilities	3-10
3.2 No-Action Alternative.....	3-11
3.2.1 Social/Community Cohesion and Public Services	3-11
3.2.2 Minority and Low-Income Populations	3-12
3.2.3 Utilities	3-12
Chapter 4 Required Permits	4-1
Chapter 5 References	5-1
Appendix A Public Service Facilities in the Study Areas	
Appendix B Minority and Low-Income Populations Demographic Data	

Tables

Table 1. Regulations, Statutes, and Guidelines for Social and Community Resources and Minority and Low-Income Populations	1-6
Table 2. Population: 2000, 2010, and 2013 Estimates	2-5
Table 3. Cowlitz County Population Projections to 2040	2-5
Table 4. 2013 Age Distribution	2-6
Table 5. 2013 Households and Average Household Size.....	2-7
Table 6. 2013 Family Composition	2-7
Table 7. Limited English Proficiency, 2013	2-8
Table 8. Population with Disability, 2013	2-9
Table 9. Median Household Income and Poverty Status, 1999 and 2013	2-10
Table 10. Housing Characteristics, 2000 and 2013.....	2-11
Table 11. Public Service Facilities in the Indirect Impacts Study Area (within 0.5 Mile of the Reynolds Lead, BNSF Spur, and BNSF Main Line)	2-15
Table 12. Minority and Low-Income Populations Study Areas' Demographic Data	2-19

Figures

Figure 1. Project Vicinity.....	1-3
Figure 2. Proposed Action	1-4
Figure 3. The 0.5-Mile Direct Impacts Study Area near the Project Area	1-8
Figure 4. Social and Community Cohesion Direct and Indirect Impacts Study Areas	1-9
Figure 5. Study Areas near the Project Area (Census Boundaries)	1-10
Figure 6. Minority and Low-Income Populations Study Area.....	1-11
Figure 7. Public Services in the Study Area—Project Areas	2-12
Figure 8. Public Services in the Study Area—Rail Main Line North.....	2-13
Figure 9. Public Services in the Study Area—Rail Main Line South.....	2-14
Figure 10. Minority and Low-Income Communities	2-21

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACS	American Community Survey
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
AMR	American Medical Response
Applicant	Millennium Bulk Terminals-Longview, LLC
BNSF	BNSF Railway Company
BPA	Bonneville Power Administration
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
City	City of Longview
County	Cowlitz County
Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology
EIS	environmental impact statement
EMT	emergency medical technician
FRA	Federal Railway Administration
LVSW	Longview Switching Company
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
RCW	Revised Code of Washington
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
SR	State Route
UP	Union Pacific Railroad

This technical report assesses the potential impacts on social and community resources of the proposed Millennium Bulk Terminals—Longview project (Proposed Action) and No-Action Alternative. For the purposes of this assessment, effects on social and community resources refers to social and community cohesion effects, effects on public services and utilities, and effects on minority and low-income populations. This report describes the regulatory setting, establishes the methods for assessing potential impacts, presents the historical and current social and community conditions of the study area, and assesses the potential for impacts on social and community resources.

1.1 Project Description

Millennium Bulk Terminals—Longview, LLC (Applicant) is proposing to construct and operate a coal export terminal (Proposed Action) in Cowlitz County, Washington along the Columbia River (Figure 1). The coal export terminal would receive coal from the Powder River Basin in Montana and Wyoming, and the Uinta Basin in Utah and Colorado via rail shipment. The coal export terminal would receive, stockpile, and load coal onto vessels and transport the coal via the Columbia River and Pacific Ocean to overseas markets in Asia.

1.1.1 Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, the Applicant would develop the coal export terminal on 190 acres (project area) primarily within an existing 540-acre site that is currently leased by the Applicant (Applicant's leased area). The project area is adjacent to the Columbia River in unincorporated Cowlitz County, Washington near Longview, Washington (Figure 2). The Applicant currently operates and would continue to operate a bulk product terminal within the Applicant's leased area.

BNSF Railway Company (BNSF) or Union Pacific Railroad (UP) trains would transport coal on BNSF main line routes in Washington State, and the BNSF Spur and Reynolds Lead in Cowlitz County to the project area. Coal would be unloaded from rail cars, stockpiled, and loaded by conveyor onto ocean-going vessels for export at two new docks (Docks 2 and 3) located in the Columbia River.


Once construction is complete, the Proposed Action could have a maximum annual throughput capacity of up to 44 million metric tons of coal per year. The coal export terminal would consist of one operating rail track, eight rail tracks for storing up to eight unit trains, rail car unloading facilities, a stockpile area for coal storage, conveyor and reclaiming facilities, two new docks in the Columbia River (Docks 2 and 3), and shiploading facilities on the two docks. Dredging of the Columbia River would be required to provide access to and from the Columbia River navigation channel and for berthing at the two new docks.

Vehicles would access the project area from Industrial Way (State Route 432), and vessels would access the project area via the Columbia River. The Reynolds Lead and BNSF Spur track—both jointly owned by BNSF and UP, and operated by Longview Switching Company (LVSW)—provide rail access to the project area from a point on the BNSF main line (Longview Junction) located to the

east in Kelso, Washington. Coal export terminal operations would occur 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. The coal export terminal would be designed for a minimum 30-year period of operation.


At full terminal operations, approximately 8 loaded unit trains each day would carry coal to the export terminal, 8 empty unit trains each day would leave the export terminal, and an average of 70 vessels per month or 840 vessels per year would be loaded, which would equate to 1,680 vessel transits in the Columbia River annually.

Figure 1. Project Vicinity



K:\Projects_3\Cowlitz_County\00264_13_MBTL_Maps\docs\Figures\01_DraftTechMemo\General\Fig1_SEPA_ProjectVicinity.mxd 19435 9/2/2015

Figure 2. Proposed Action



1.1.2 No-Action Alternative

The Applicant plans to continue operating its existing bulk product terminal located adjacent to the project area. Ongoing operations would include storing and transporting alumina and small quantities of coal, and continued use of Dock 1. Maintenance of the existing bulk product terminal would continue, including maintenance dredging at the existing dock every 2 to 3 years. The Applicant plans to expand operations at the existing bulk product terminal, which could include increased storage and upland transfer of bulk products utilizing new and existing buildings. The Applicant would likely need to undertake demolition, construction, and other related activities to develop expanded bulk product terminal facilities.

If the coal export terminal is not constructed, the Applicant would likely propose expansion of the bulk product terminal onto areas that would have been subject to construction and operation of the proposed coal export terminal. Additional bulk product transfer activities could involve products such as a calcined pet coke, coal tar pitch, cement, fly ash, and sand or gravel. Any new operations would be evaluated under applicable regulations. Upland areas of the project area are zoned Heavy Industrial and it is assumed future proposed industrial uses in these upland areas could be permitted. Any new construction would be limited to uses allowed under existing Cowlitz County development regulations.

1.2 Regulatory Setting

The jurisdictional authorities and corresponding regulations, statutes, and guidance for determining potential impacts related to social and community resources and minority and low-income populations are summarized in Table 1. As shown, these laws and regulations pertain to the assessment of minority and low-income populations (i.e., environmental justice).

Table 1. Regulations, Statutes, and Guidelines for Social and Community Resources and Minority and Low-Income Populations

Regulation, Statute, Guideline	Description
Federal	
National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4321 <i>et seq.</i>)	Requires the consideration of potential environmental impacts. NEPA implementation procedures are set forth in the President's Council on Environmental Quality's Regulations for Implementing NEPA (49 CFR 1105).
Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 USC 2000d) as amended by the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (P.L. 100-209)	Prohibits discrimination based on race, color, sex, and national origin in the provision of benefits and services resulting from federally assisted programs and activities. Under the prohibition against national origin discrimination, recipients of federal funding are required to ensure that their programs and activities normally provided in English are accessible to limited English proficiency persons.
Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC 126, 12101, <i>et seq.</i> (as amended)	Prohibits discrimination based on disability.
Presidential Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice	Promotes nondiscrimination in federal programs substantially affecting human health and the environment and provides minority and low-income community access to public information on, and an opportunity for public participation in, matters relating to human health or the environment.
CEQ Environmental Justice Guidance under NEPA	Provides guidance to assist federal agencies with their NEPA procedures so that environmental justice concerns are effectively identified and addressed.
State	
Washington State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21c)	SEPA directs state and local agencies to consider environmental impacts (cumulative, short-term, long-term, direct, and indirect), alternatives, and mitigation before committing to an action. SEPA gives agencies the authority to condition or deny a proposal based on the agency's adopted SEPA policies and environmental impacts identified in a SEPA document (RCW 43.21C.060, WAC 197-11-660).
Local	
Cowlitz County SEPA Regulations (CCC 19.11)	The County has adopted and incorporated rules pertaining to the integration of policies and procedures as required under SEPA (RCW 43.21C.120).
Notes: USC = United States Code; NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act; CFR = Code of Federal Regulations; CEQ = Council on Environmental Quality; RCW = Revised Code of Washington; SEPA = Washington State Environmental Policy Act; County = Cowlitz County; WAC = Washington Administrative Code; CCC = Cowlitz County Code; P.L. = Public Law	

1.3 Study Areas

The study areas for social and community resources assessment for the Proposed Action are defined below.

- **Social/Community Cohesion and Public Services:** For direct impacts, the study area is the project area and the area within 0.5 mile of the project area. For indirect impacts, the study area is the project area and the area within 0.5 mile of the affected rail lines in Cowlitz County (the Reynolds Lead, BNSF Spur, and BNSF main line).
- **Minority and Low-Income Populations:** The study area for direct impacts is the project area and the area within approximately 1 mile of the project area. This study area only relates to construction and operations of the Proposed Action. The study area for indirect impacts is the area within 0.5 mile of the affected rail lines in Cowlitz County.
- **Utilities:** For direct impacts, the study area is the project area and the area within 0.5 mile of the project area. This study area only relates to construction and operation of the Proposed Action. For indirect impacts, the study area is the project area and the area within 0.5 mile of the project area.

The direct impacts (0.5-mile) study areas around the project areas for the Proposed Action are shown on Figure 3. The direct and indirect impacts study areas for social and community cohesion are shown on Figure 4.

As discussed later in this report, demographic data has been compiled for the various study areas based on the U.S. Census Bureau (census) block group boundaries that most closely conform to the study area boundaries. For social/community cohesion and public services, the census block groups that represent the direct impacts (0.5-mile) study area around the project areas are shown in Figure 5. The direct impacts study area for social/community cohesion and public services is represented by Census Tract 3 Block Group 1, Census Tract 7.03 Block Group 1, and Census Tract 19 Block Group 1. For minority and low-income populations, the census block groups that represent the direct impacts (1-mile) study area around the project areas and the indirect impacts (0.5-mile) study area around the affected rail line are shown in Figure 6.

Figure 3. The 0.5-Mile Direct Impacts Study Area near the Project Area




Figure 5. Study Areas near the Project Area (Census Boundaries)





Figure 6. Minority and Low-Income Populations Study Area



This chapter explains the methods for assessing the existing conditions and determining impacts, and describes the existing conditions in the study area as they pertain to social and community resources.

2.1 Methods

This section describes the sources of information and methods used to characterize the affected environment and evaluate the potential impacts of the Proposed Action and No-Action Alternative on social/community cohesion and public services, minority and low-income populations, and utilities.

2.1.1 Data Sources

The following sources of information were used to evaluate the social/community cohesion and public services, minority and low-income populations, and utilities characteristics of the study areas.

- U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 and 2010 data and 2009–2013 American Community Survey (ACS) data available on American FactFinder (<http://factfinder.census.gov/>).
- State of Washington Office of Financial Management (<http://www.ofm.wa.gov/>).
- Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments (<http://www.cwcog.org/>).
- Various websites to inventory public service facilities in the study areas, including Google Maps and websites for Cowlitz County and the Cities of Castle Rock, Kelso, Woodland, and Longview.

2.1.2 Impact Analysis

The following methods were used to evaluate the potential impacts of the Proposed Action and No-Action Alternative on social/community cohesion and public services, minority and low-income populations, and utilities. For the purposes of this analysis, construction impacts are based on peak construction period and operations impacts are based on maximum throughput capacity (up to 44 million metric tons per year).

2.1.2.1 Social/Community Cohesion and Public Services

The analysis describes existing social and community cohesion in terms of the area's population characteristics, the various public services and social institutions that serve the community, and the access and linkages between the community and those services.

The analysis then evaluates if the alternatives could affect social and community cohesion by altering population characteristics, dividing or isolating a neighborhood, or separating residents from public services by changing travel patterns. This evaluation considers the location of public services in the study areas relative to characteristics of the alternatives. Impacts on social and community cohesion occur when an action:

- Divides or isolates part of a neighborhood.
- Displaces or alters a public service facility, such as an educational facility, library, public park, or recreational facility.
- Generates substantial new development or changes property values leading to the displacement of substantial portions of the existing community.

Impacts on public services occur when an action introduces a new population or service demand that affects the services delivered by a public service facility, or if an action separates residents from public services by changing travel patterns or access to the service.

2.1.2.2 Minority and Low-Income Populations

The assessment of minority and low-income populations for the alternatives was based on the CEQ guidance identified above and involved six basic steps.

1. Identify the areas where the alternatives could cause adverse impacts either during construction or operation (i.e., the study area described in Section 1.3, *Study Areas*).
2. Compile minority and low-income data for the census block groups within the study areas and identify minority and low-income populations
3. Identify the alternatives' potential adverse effects on minority and/or low-income populations.
4. Evaluate the alternatives' potential adverse effects on minority and/or low-income communities relative to the effects on the overall population to determine if potential adverse effects on those communities would be disproportionately high and adverse.
5. Discuss mitigation measures for any identified disproportionate adverse effects.
6. Describe the public outreach and participation process for effectively engaging minority and low-income populations in the decision-making process.

Identification of Minority and Low-Income Populations

Census block groups were selected as the geographic unit for analysis to avoid artificially diluting or inflating the affected populations, consistent with CEQ guidance. As shown in Figure 5, the study area for direct and indirect impacts includes 46 census block groups.

Data on race, ethnicity, and poverty status were gathered from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2009–2013 ACS for the census block groups in the study area. For comparison purposes, data for the City of Longview and Cowlitz County were also compiled. Based on census data and CEQ guidance, potential minority and low-income communities were identified as follows.

- **Minority communities:** CEQ guidance defines minorities to include American Indians or Alaskan Natives, Asian and Pacific Islanders, African Americans or Black persons, and Hispanic persons. This analysis also considers minority populations to include persons who identified themselves as being either "some other race" or "two or more races" in the 2009–2013 ACS. Following CEQ guidance, minority populations were identified where either: (1) the minority population of the affected area exceeds 50%; or (2) the minority population percentage of the affected area is meaningfully greater than the minority population percentage in the general population or other appropriate comparison unit of geographic analysis (Council on Environmental Quality 1997). For the purposes of this analysis, *meaningfully greater* is

interpreted as *at least 50% greater*. This analysis used Cowlitz County as the primary comparison area. In Cowlitz County, the minority population in the 2009–2013 ACS was 14.6% of the total population. Therefore, this analysis considers any study area block group with a minority population of greater than 21.9% to be a minority community.

- **Low-income communities:** The study defines low-income populations as the percent of individuals living below the poverty level in each census block group, as presented in the 2009–2013 ACS. CEQ guidance does not specify a threshold for identifying clusters of low-income populations. Therefore, for this analysis, any census block group with a percentage of low-income population at least 50% greater than the percentage in Cowlitz County as a whole was considered a low-income community. In Cowlitz County, the low-income population (the population with incomes below the poverty level) is approximately 17.6% of the total population. Therefore, low-income communities were identified where the census block group population living below the poverty level exceeds 26.4%.

Identification of Potential Disproportionately High and Adverse Effects

The technical reports and the resource sections in the environmental impact statement (EIS) present the impacts resulting from construction and operation of the alternatives. These impacts were evaluated for their potential to result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations. The determination of the alternatives' potential to result in disproportionately high and adverse effects involved the following considerations.

- If the adverse project impact is considered significant.
- If the impacts on minority or low-income populations would appreciably exceed, or would be likely to appreciably exceed, the risk or rate to the general population.
- If the minority or low-income population would be affected by cumulative or multiple adverse exposures from environmental hazards.¹

In making this determination following CEQ guidance, it was recognized that impacts on minority or low-income populations may be different from impacts on the general population (e.g., due to a community's distinct cultural practices, such as a pattern of living that relies on subsistence fish, vegetation, or wildlife consumption). The determination of disproportionately high and adverse effects also involved consideration of proposed mitigation measures and offsetting benefits.

2.1.2.3 Utilities

The assessment of utilities in this report focuses on water utilities, including potable water and wastewater service, and electrical utilities. Electricity and natural gas consumption are addressed in the SEPA Energy and Natural Resources Technical Report (ICF 2017a). The evaluation assesses whether the alternatives would have the potential to affect utility service directly by altering the water supply or wastewater conveyance system or electrical utilities. The evaluation also assesses the potential for indirect impacts from new demands on water supply capacity and/or wastewater treatment capacity.

¹ According to CEQ guidance, the term “environmental hazard” means a chemical, biological, physical, or radiological agent, situation, or source that has the potential for deleterious effects to the environment and/or human health.

2.2 Existing Conditions

The existing environmental conditions related to social/community cohesion and public services, minority and low-income populations, and utilities in the study areas are described below.

2.2.1 Social/Community Cohesion and Public Services

This section describes social and community cohesion in terms of population, the various public services and social institutions that serve the community, and the access and linkages between the community and those services.

The direct impacts study area (project area and within 0.5 mile of the project area) is characterized by predominantly industrial and transportation/utility land uses, along with limited residential uses to the north of Mount Solo Road. The area east of the project areas is part of a wide corridor of industrial land uses along the Columbia River. Notable uses within the direct impacts study area include the Weyerhaeuser Company lumber products manufacturing site/North Pacific Paper Corporation (NORPAC) facility and Mint Farm Industrial Park. The area west of the project areas is Barlow Point, which includes an undeveloped parcel owned by the Port of Longview, the closed Mount Solo Landfill, and large-lot residential and agricultural land uses south of Industrial Way. Neighborhood areas in the direct impacts study area include Barlow Point, Memorial Park, and Mint Farm (City of Longview 2007).

The indirect impacts study area along the Reynolds Lead and BNSF Spur (within 0.5 mile of these rail lines) includes the Highlands neighborhood and the Industrial and California Way neighborhood in Longview. The Highlands neighborhood is predominantly residential. The Industrial and California Way neighborhood includes a mix of commercial and industrial uses. On the BNSF main line, the indirect impacts study area (within 0.5 mile of this rail line) includes undeveloped and low-density rural land uses, and urban areas, including Castle Rock, Kelso, Carrolls, Kalama, and Woodland.

2.2.1.1 Population Characteristics

Population characteristics for the study area—including local population, population projections, age distribution, households, family composition, race and ethnicity, limited English proficiency, disability status, median household income and poverty status, and housing characteristics—are described in the following sections.

Population

Table 2 presents the population for the direct impacts study area, Longview, and Cowlitz County in 2000, 2010, and 2013. In 2013, the direct impacts study area had a population of approximately 2,964, compared to 36,656 in Longview and 102,110 in Cowlitz County. The population of the direct impacts study area has declined by approximately 3% since 2000. In comparison, the populations of both Longview and Cowlitz County grew from 2000 to 2010 and remained flat from 2010 to 2013.

Table 2. Population: 2000, 2010, and 2013 Estimates

Area	Population 2000	Population 2010	Percent (%) Change 2000-2010	Population 2013	Percent (%) Change 2010- 2013
Direct Impacts Study Area (Project Area and Within 0.5 mile of the Project Area)					
Census Tract 3, Block Group 1 ^a	868	509	-41.4	570	12.0
Census Tract 7.03, Block Group 1 ^b	1,367	1,601	--	1,373	-14.2
Census Tract 19, Block Group 1	827	956	15.6	1,021	6.8
	3,062	3,066	0.1	2,964	-3.3
Longview	34,660	36,648	5.7	36,656	0.0
Cowlitz County	92,948	102,410	10.2	102,110	-0.3

Notes:

Census Tract and Block Groups are shown on Figure 5.

^a The drop in population in this census tract is largely due to the displacement of mobile home units in the area from 2000 to 2010. In particular, the 166-space River City RV and Mobile Home Park, located near the corner of California Way and 7th Avenue, closed in 2009 to make way for the development of a Super Walmart.

^b Census Tract 7.03 Block Group 1 applies to demographic data for 2010 and 2013. In the 2000 Census, this area is closely approximated by Census Tract 7.01 Block Group 4. The 2000 Census data is presented for informational purposes, but a percent change is not presented because the geographic areas are not identical.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, U.S. Census Bureau 2010, U.S. Census Bureau 2013

Population Projections

Table 3 shows the population projections of the Washington State Office of Financial Management for Cowlitz County to 2040 (Washington State Office of Financial Management 2012). The population of Cowlitz County is projected to grow by approximately 6% from 2010 to 2020 and then experience lower growth rates from 2020 to 2030 and 2030 to 2040. In 2040, the population of Cowlitz County is projected to be 116,897 people, compared to 102,410 people in 2010. Over the coming decades, it is expected that the age distribution in Cowlitz County will shift, with an increase in the elderly population (age 65 and over) and a decrease in the school-age population (age 0 to 17) (Cowlitz County Department of Building and Planning 2015). It is also expected that the proportion of the population with a disability will increase as the share of elderly population increases.

Table 3. Cowlitz County Population Projections to 2040

Area	Population 2010	Population 2020	Population 2030	Population 2040	Percent Change 2010-2040
Cowlitz County	102,410	108,588	114,158	116,897	14.1
Percent Change over Previous 10 Years	--	6.0	5.1	2.4	--

Source: Washington State Office of Financial Management 2012

Age Distribution

Table 4 presents the age distribution of the population in 2013 for the direct impacts study area, Longview, and Cowlitz County. In 2013, most of this population was between 18 and 64 in age, generally considered working age. Compared to both Longview and Cowlitz County, the direct

impacts study area had a smaller proportion of people age 17 and under and a greater proportion age 65 and over.

Table 4. 2013 Age Distribution

Area	Total Population	School-Age (0-17)		Working Age (18-64)		Age 65 and Over	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Direct Impacts Study Area (Project Area and within 0.5 mile of the Project Area)							
Census Tract 3, Block Group 1	570	135	23.7	314	55.1	121	21.2
Census Tract 7.03, Block Group 1	1,373	240	17.5	726	52.9	407	29.6
Census Tract 19, Block Group 1	1,021	209	20.5	656	64.3	156	15.3
	2,964	584	19.7	1,696	57.2	684	23.1
Longview	36,656	8,348	22.8	21,720	59.3	6,588	18.0
Cowlitz County	102,110	24,399	23.9	61,087	59.8	16,624	16.3

Note: Census Tract and Block Groups are shown on Figure 5.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2013

Households

Table 5 shows the number of households and average household size in the direct impacts study area, Longview, and Cowlitz County. In 2013, there were approximately 1,321 households in the direct impacts study area, a 3.7% increase since 2000. In Longview and Cowlitz County, there were approximately 15,000 and 39,602 households, respectively. Compared to the direct impacts study area, the number of households in both Longview and Cowlitz County increased by a greater percentage from 2000 to 2013.

Table 5. 2013 Households and Average Household Size

Area	Households		Percent Change 2000–2013	Average Household Size	
	2000	2013		2000	2013
Direct Impacts Study Area (Project Area and Within 0.5 mile of the Project Area)					
Census Tract 3, Block Group 1 ^a	446	273	-38.8	1.95	2.09
Census Tract 7.03, Block Group 1 ^b	515	660	--	2.65	2.07
Census Tract 19, Block Group 1	313	388	24.0	2.64	2.63
	1,274	1,321	3.7	2.40	2.24
Longview	14,066	15,000	6.6	2.40	2.39
Cowlitz County	35,850	39,602	10.5	2.55	2.55

Notes:

Census Tract and Block Groups are shown on Figure 5.

^a The reduction in number of households in this census tract is largely due to the displacement of mobile home units in the area from 2000 to 2010. In particular, the 166-space River City RV and Mobile Home Park, located near the corner of California Way and 7th Avenue, closed in 2009 to make way for the development of a Super Walmart.

^b Census Tract 7.03 Block Group 1 applies to demographic data for 2010 and 2013. In the 2000 Census, this area is closely approximated by Census Tract 7.01 Block Group 4. The 2000 Census data is presented for informational purposes, but a percent change is not presented because the geographic areas are not identical.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, U.S. Census Bureau 2010, U.S. Census Bureau 2013

Family Composition

Table 6 presents the family composition of the population in the direct impacts study area, Longview, and Cowlitz County. In census data, a family consists of two or more people related by birth, marriage, or adoption residing in the same housing unit. In 2013, approximately 20 to 25% of the families in all three areas were married couples with children under age 18, and approximately half of all families were married couples without children under age 18. In the direct impacts study area, approximately 12.6% of families were led by single parents with children under age 18, compared to approximately 17% in Longview and 15% in Cowlitz County overall.

Table 6. 2013 Family Composition

Area	Total Families	Percent of Total Families			
		Married Couple, with Children Under 18	Married Couple, No Children Under 18	Single Parent, with Children Under 18	Single Parent, No Children Under 18
Direct Impacts Study Area (Project Area and Within 0.5 mile of the Project Area)					
Census Tract 3, Block Group 1	101	25.7	29.7	26.7	17.8
Census Tract 7.03, Block Group 1	381	22.6	54.1	11.5	11.8
Census Tract 19, Block Group 1	286	18.9	67.1	9.1	4.9
	768	21.6	55.7	12.6	10.0
Longview	9,125	22.5	48.9	17.3	11.3
Cowlitz County	26,726	24.6	51.1	15.0	9.3

Note: Census Tract and Block Groups are shown on Figure 5.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2013

Race and Ethnicity

Population characteristics related to race and ethnicity are presented in Section 2.2.2, *Minority and Low-Income Populations*, below.

Limited English Proficiency

Table 7 shows the percentage of the population over age 5 with limited English proficiency in the direct impacts study area, Longview, and Cowlitz County. In all three areas, a low percentage of the population over age 5 has limited English proficiency; approximately 3% of the population of the direct impacts study area, Longview, and Cowlitz County, has limited English proficiency.

Table 7. Limited English Proficiency, 2013

Area	Population Age 5 and Over	Population Age 5 and Over with Limited English Proficiency ^a	Percentage Population with Limited English Proficiency ^a
Direct Impacts Study Area (Project Area and Within 0.5 mile of the Project Area)			
Census Tract 3, Block Group 1	513	59	11.5
Census Tract 7.03, Block Group 1	1,270	31	2.4
Census Tract 19, Block Group 1	971	0	0.0
	2,754	90	3.3
Longview	34,354	1,194	3.5
Cowlitz County	95,579	2,939	3.1

Note:

Census Tract and Block Groups are shown on Figure 5.

^a Limited English proficiency includes individuals who speak English less than very well (defined as “well,” “not well,” or “not at all” in Census data.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2013

Disability Status

Table 8 presents the disability status for the population age 16 to 64 in the direct impacts study area, Longview, and Cowlitz County.² In 2013, the direct impacts study area had a higher percentage of the population with a disability (approximately 28.6%) compared to both Longview (20.9%) and Cowlitz County (17.5%).

² In the ACS, disability data includes any respondent who reports having any one of the following six disability types: hearing difficulty, vision difficulty, cognitive disability, ambulatory disability, self-care difficulty, or independent living disability.

Table 8. Population with Disability, 2013

Area	Population Age 16–64	Percent with a Disability
Direct Impacts Study Area (Project Area and Within 0.5 mile of the Project Area)		
Census Tract 3, Block Group 1	335	33.4
Census Tract 7.03, Block Group 1	749	23.0
Census Tract 19, Block Group 1	683	32.5
	1,767	28.6
Longview	22,559	20.9
Cowlitz County	63,915	17.5

Note: Census Tract and Block Groups are shown on Figure 5.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2013

Median Household Income and Poverty Status

Table 9 presents the median household income and the proportion of individuals living below the poverty level for the direct impacts study area block groups, Longview, and Cowlitz County. In 2013, the median household income for the direct impacts study area block groups ranged from approximately \$12,072 to approximately \$48,000, compared to approximately \$39,422 in Longview and approximately \$47,596 in Cowlitz County overall. The study area block groups, Longview, and Cowlitz County all experienced substantial decreases in median household income from 1999 to 2013 and increases in the percentage of individuals living below the poverty level. The percentage of individuals below the poverty level in the study area block groups ranged from approximately 23.5 to 44.7%, compared to 22.6% in Longview and 17.6% in Cowlitz County overall. Census Tract 3, Block Group 1, in the direct impacts study area, had the lowest median household income and highest percentage of the population living below the poverty level in both 1999 and 2013. In general, the decreases in median household income shown in Table 9 are indicative of the decline in total manufacturing jobs and the average manufacturing wage, part of a larger trend in declining, inflation-adjusted incomes in Cowlitz County (City of Longview 2006).

Table 9. Median Household Income and Poverty Status, 1999 and 2013

Area	Median Household Income			Percent of Individuals Below Poverty Level ^d	
	1999 ^a	2013 ^a	Percent Change	1999	2013
Direct Impacts Study Area (Project Area and Within 0.5 mile of the Project Area)					
Census Tract 3, Block Group 1 ^b	\$25,703	\$12,072	-53.0	28.1	44.7
Census Tract 7.03, Block Group 1 ^c	\$52,958	\$39,848	--	20.8	23.7
Census Tract 19, Block Group 1	\$84,037	\$48,000	-42.9	7.3	23.5
Longview	\$49,107	\$39,422	-19.7	16.7	22.6
Cowlitz County	\$55,566	\$47,596	-14.3	14.0	17.6

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, U.S. Census Bureau 2013

Notes:

Census Tract and Block Groups are shown on Figure 5.

- ^a The 2013 ACS data reflects incomes over 2009 to 2013. Census 2000 reflects income data over the prior calendar year (1999). The median household income is presented in inflation-adjusted 2013 dollars using the U.S. Department of Labor's Annual 2013 Consumer Price Index for the "West Area."
- ^b The reduction in median household income in this census tract is largely due to the displacement of mobile home units in the area from 2000 to 2010. In particular, the 166-space River City RV and Mobile Home Park, located near the corner of California Way and 7th Avenue, closed in 2009 to make way for the development of a Super Walmart.
- ^c Census Tract 7.03 Block Group 1 applies to demographic data for 2013. In the 2000 Census, this area is closely approximated by Census Tract 7.01 Block Group 4. The 2000 Census data is presented for informational purposes, but a percent change is not presented because the geographic areas are not identical.
- ^d Percent of individuals with incomes below poverty level, as established by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Housing Characteristics

Table 10 presents housing unit characteristics for the direct impacts study area, Longview, and Cowlitz County. In 2013, there were approximately 1,386 housing units in the direct impacts study area, of which approximately 95.3% were occupied. The occupancy rate in the direct impacts study area was higher than in Longview and Cowlitz County, but the direct impacts study area lost almost 45% of its housing units between 2000 and 2013. In 2013, there were approximately 16,415 housing units in Longview and approximately 43,356 housing units in Cowlitz County. In both areas, the occupancy rate was approximately 91%.

Table 10. Housing Characteristics, 2000 and 2013

Area	Housing Units			2013 Occupancy Status		2013 Tenure, All Occupied Units	
	2000	2013	% Change	% Occupied	% Vacant	% Owner-Occupied	% Renter-Occupied
Direct Impacts Study Area (Project Area and Within 0.5 mile of the Project Area)							
Census Tract 3, Block Group 1 ^a	524	289	-44.8	94.5	5.5	49.5	50.5
Census Tract 7.03, Block Group 1 ^b	609	709	--	93.1	6.9	78.6	21.4
Census Tract 19, Block Group 1	333	388	16.5	100.0	0.0	63.7	36.3
	1,466	1,386	-5.5	95.3	4.7	68.2	31.8
Longview	15,225	16,415	7.8	91.4	8.6	56.0	44.0
Cowlitz County	38,624	43,356	12.3	91.3	8.7	66.2	33.8

Note:

Census Tract and Block Groups are shown on Figure 5.

^a The reduction in number of housing units in this census tract is largely due to the displacement of mobile home units in the area from 2000 to 2010. In particular, the 166-space River City RV and Mobile Home Park, located near the corner of California Way and 7th Avenue, closed in 2009 to make way for the development of a Super Walmart.

^b Census Tract 7.03 Block Group 1 applies to demographic data for 2013. In the 2000 Census, this area is closely approximated by Census Tract 7.01 Block Group 4. The 2000 Census data is presented for informational purposes, but a percent change is not presented because the geographic areas are not identical.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2013

2.2.1.2 Public Services

For the purposes of this assessment, public services include educational facilities, religious institutions, social institutions (e.g., veterans groups), medical facilities, fire protection and emergency medical services, police services, cemeteries, public park and recreation facilities, and other notable public services and government institutions. This section identifies the existing public service facilities located within the direct and indirect impacts study areas.

As shown on Figure 7, there are no public services located within the direct impacts study area.

There are several facilities located within indirect impacts study area (Figures 7, 8, and 9). Appendix A lists the public service facilities within the study area, and Table 11 presents a summary of this list. The indirect impacts study area includes undeveloped and low-density rural land uses, and urban areas, including Castle Rock, Longview, Kelso, Carrolls, Kalama, and Woodland. In general, most public facilities are clustered within and around these urban areas.

Figure 7. Public Services in the Study Area—Project Areas




Figure 8. Public Services in the Study Area—Rail Main Line North





Figure 9. Public Services in the Study Area—Rail Main Line South



Transportation services (such as roads and pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities) that provide access and linkages to and among these facilities are discussed below. In addition, fire protection services are discussed in more detail below.

Table 11. Public Service Facilities in the Indirect Impacts Study Area (within 0.5 Mile of the Reynolds Lead, BNSF Spur, and BNSF Main Line)

Type of Facility	Area					
	Longview	Kelso	Kalama	Castle Rock	Woodland	Unincorporated Cowlitz County
Educational Facility	2	3	2	3	4	1
Religious Institution	4	11	2	6	3	6
Social Institution	1	4	1	3	3	0
Medical Facility	2	2	0	1	2	0
Fire Protection	1	2	1	1	1	2
Police Facility	1	3	1	1	1	0
Cemetery	0	0	0	0	0	3
Library	0	1	0	1	1	0
Park and Recreation Facility	3	10	1	4	3	1
Other	7	14	2	2	2	1
Total	21	50	10	22	20	14

Access and Linkages

A variety of roadway, pedestrian, transit, and bicycle transportation facilities provide access to and among the various public service facilities. Local roadways, Interstate 5 (I-5), and state highways provide access to public service facilities and between the various urban areas within Cowlitz County. In general, pedestrian access is better in the downtown urban areas located along the rail line, such as in Longview and Kelso, than in more rural, suburban, and industrial areas.

River Cities Transit provides public transit throughout the Longview/Kelso area. The closest transit route to the project areas is Route 31, which runs along 32nd Avenue, Washington Way, and Alabama Street into downtown Longview. The nearest portion of Route 31 is approximately 1 mile from the project areas. Route 33 and Route 44 both run along Ocean Beach Highway and are approximately 1 to 2 miles from the Proposed Action project area. Frequent and comprehensive transit service is a critical support service to residents with no access to a vehicle, especially those who are low-income, homeless, and/or reliant on public transit (River Cities Transit 2015). However, no fixed transit routes directly serve the project areas, nor do any routes cross the Reynolds Lead.

Within Cowlitz County, there are various bicycle trails in parks and along certain waterfront areas. Several bicycle trails are located along the Columbia and Cowlitz rivers; however, there are no designated bicycle trails in the direct impacts study areas. The following bicycle trails may provide access to public services (as opposed to closed loop trails within small parks) within the study area.

- **Coweeman River Trail** runs along the Coweeman River in Kelso and is near Kelso High School, Coweeman Middle School, and Three Rivers Mall. The southernmost portion of the trail near the confluence with the Cowlitz River is within the study area.
- **Cowlitz Dike Trail** runs between the Cowlitz River and the BNSF Railway through downtown Kelso. This trail provides access to public services within downtown Kelso and Longview.

- **East and West Riverfront Trails** run on both sides of the Cowlitz River in Castle Rock and provide access to public services within Castle Rock. The northern and southern portions of this trail are within the study area.
- **Kalama Industrial Trail and Kalama Marine Park Trail.** The Kalama Marine Park trail runs along the Kalama waterfront between the Columbia River and the BNSF Railway through Kalama Marine Park. The Kalama Industrial Trail connects industrial areas within the Port of Kalama to the Columbia River.
- **Highlands Trail** runs along the residential side of Industrial Way from State Route 433/Oregon Way to 32nd Avenue and Washington Way. This trail provides access from residential areas to industrial areas along the Columbia River. (Cowlitz on the Move n.d.)

Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

The Cowlitz 2 Fire & Rescue District, the Longview Fire Department, and American Medical Response (AMR) provide emergency medical services (EMS) and fire protection for the project areas.

Cowlitz 2 Fire & Rescue

Cowlitz 2 Fire & Rescue provides fire protection services to the project area, and serves approximately 34,000 citizens in the city of Kelso and unincorporated Cowlitz County, responding to approximately 4,100 calls per year (Cowlitz 2 Fire & Rescue 2015). The district is staffed by approximately 120 full-time and volunteer members in five active fire stations, two of which are staffed with full-time EMT and paramedic firefighters. Volunteer firefighter EMTs also respond on an on-call basis. The district includes the following stations and apparatus.

- Station 21 (Headquarters) is staffed with 27 full-time personnel, and includes a main response fire engine, a volunteer/reserve ready fire engine, an advanced life support ambulance, and a reserve-ready advanced life support ambulance. This station includes three rotating shifts, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. During each shift, at least eight personnel staff a variety of apparatus.
- Station 22 (Baker's Corner) is staffed with one volunteer and includes a main response fire engine, a 3,000-gallon water supply, an EMS/wild-land response, and an EMS response/ambulance. This is all-volunteer station serves as a crucial first responder before additional help arrives.
- Station 23 (Columbia Heights) is staffed full time by firefighter/EMT, firefighter/paramedic, and volunteer personnel, and includes a main response fire engine, an EMS/wild-land response, an advanced life support ambulance, a basic life support ambulance, and a hazardous materials response apparatus.
- Station 24 (Rose Valley) is staffed with one volunteer and includes a main response fire engine and an EMS/wild-land response. This is all-volunteer station serves as a crucial first responder before additional help arrives.
- Station 25 (Lexington) is staffed with two volunteers and includes an initial response fire engine, a 2,000-gallon water supply, and an EMS/wild-land response. This all-volunteer station serves as a crucial first responder before additional help arrives.

- Station 27 (Kelso) is staffed with three volunteers and includes a main response fire engine and a 3,000-gallon water supply. This all-volunteer station backs up personnel at Station 21 (Headquarters) when they are on calls.

Cowlitz 2 Fire & Rescue maintains automatic aid agreements with the Longview Fire Department (discussed below) and mutual aid agreements with all jurisdictions in Cowlitz County and others in the region (i.e., Clark County and communities in Oregon) (URS Corporation 2014).³ Therefore, although Cowlitz 2 Fire and Rescue would be a primary responder to incidents at the project area, other facilities would also respond to incidents as needed.

American Medical Response

AMR is a private ambulance company that provides emergency and non-emergency medical transport service for the study area. AMR includes approximately 35 paramedics and EMTs, and handles an average of 7,500 calls annually (American Medical Response 2015). The medical transport vehicles are based out of the facility near the Cowlitz Way intersection with Long Avenue.

2.2.2 Minority and Low-Income Populations

This section describes the existing minority and low-income populations in the study areas that could be affected by the construction and operation of the alternatives. For direct impacts on minority and low-income populations, the study area is the project area and the area within approximately 1 mile of the project area. For indirect impacts on minority and low-income populations, the study area is the area within 0.5 mile of the affected rail lines in Cowlitz County.

2.2.2.1 Minority and Low-Income Populations

Race, ethnicity, and poverty characteristics were compiled for the study areas' block groups, Longview, and Cowlitz County as a whole. Table 12 provides the population, percent minority, and percent low-income for each block group in the study areas. Of the 46 census block groups within the study area, 16 have minority populations that exceed the 21.9% threshold (see Section 2.1.2.2, *Minority and Low-Income Populations*), ranging from 23.7 to 42.4%. In addition, 18 of the census block groups have low-income populations that exceed the 26.4% threshold, ranging from 26.6 to 57.6%. Appendix B provides detailed data on race, ethnicity, and poverty status for the study areas.

Overall, 21 of the study areas' 46 block groups are considered minority and/or low-income communities for the purposes of this analysis. The remaining 25 block groups are not considered minority or low-income.

Within the direct impacts study area, three of six block groups are identified as minority or low-income communities. These block groups are located to the east of the project areas. These block groups contain industrial uses in the areas nearest the project areas, and residential uses are located

³ Automatic aid is assistance dispatched automatically by contractual agreement between two communities or fire districts to all first alarm structural fires. For example, Cowlitz 2 Fire & Rescue does not have a ladder truck. Therefore, they have an automatic aid agreement with Longview in the case of an apartment fire where a ladder truck is needed. That differs from mutual aid or assistance arranged case by case. Mutual aid is requested in cases that require special equipment such as technical rescue or an incident that requires more fire engines than the primary responder has available.

approximately 1 mile or more from the project areas. The nearest residences to the project areas (those located north of SR 432) are not located within a minority and/or low-income community.

Within the indirect impacts study area, 18 of 40 block groups are identified as minority or low-income communities. These block groups are located along the Reynolds Lead and BNSF Spur in Longview and along the BNSF main line primarily in Longview, Kelso, and Woodland.

During interviews conducted for the Proposed Action's public involvement plan, stakeholders expressed that the Highlands neighborhood in the City of Longview warranted environmental justice consideration under Executive Order 12898. Consistent with that recommendation, this analysis identifies the Highlands neighborhood in the City of Longview as a minority and low-income community. The Highlands neighborhood corresponds with Census Tract 5.02, Block Groups 1, 2, and 3.

Figure 10 shows the location of minority and low-income communities in the study area.

Table 12. Minority and Low-Income Populations Study Areas' Demographic Data

Census Block Group	2013 Total Population	Minority Population	Minority (Percent)	Population for Whom Poverty Status is Determined	Individuals Below Poverty Level	Individuals Below Poverty Level (Percent)
Direct Impacts Study Area (Project Area and Within 1 Mile of the Project Area)						
Census Tract 3, Block Group 1	570	202	35.4	570	255	44.7
Census Tract 6.01, Block Group 3	1,025	435	42.4	1,025	328	32.0
Census Tract 6.01, Block Group 4 ^a	881	176	20.0	881	277	31.4
Census Tract 7.03, Block Group 1	1,373	207	15.1	1,373	325	23.7
Census Tract 7.04, Block Group 4	1,912	228	11.9	1,912	360	18.8
Census Tract 19, Block Group 1	1,021	20	2.0	1,021	240	23.5
Direct Impacts Study Area Census Block Groups^a	6,782	1,267	18.7	6,782	1,785	26.3
Indirect Impacts Study Area (Within 0.5 Mile of the Reynolds Lead, BNSF Spur, and BNSF Main Line)						
Census Tract 5.01, Block Group 1	846	206	24.3	846	209	24.7
Census Tract 5.01, Block Group 2	1,047	248	23.7	1,047	222	21.2
Census Tract 5.01, Block Group 3	952	79	8.3	943	177	18.8
Census Tract 5.02, Block Group 1	1,587	526	33.1	1,587	628	39.6
Census Tract 5.02, Block Group 2	1,841	517	28.1	1,841	1,061	57.6
Census Tract 5.02, Block Group 3	1,454	384	26.4	1,454	651	44.8
Census Tract 8, Block Group 6	1,203	63	5.2	1,203	93	7.7
Census Tract 9, Block Group 2	2,980	652	21.9	2,950	163	5.5
Census Tract 9, Block Group 4	1,891	213	11.3	1,790	155	8.7
Census Tract 10, Block Group 1	899	316	35.2	899	374	41.6
Census Tract 10, Block Group 2	288	6	2.1	288	82	28.5
Census Tract 11, Block Group 1	717	69	9.6	717	173	24.1
Census Tract 11, Block Group 2	506	127	25.1	506	236	46.6
Census Tract 11, Block Group 3	704	215	30.5	704	276	39.2
Census Tract 11, Block Group 4	579	78	13.5	579	161	27.8
Census Tract 11, Block Group 5	1,361	488	35.9	1,361	511	37.5
Census Tract 11, Block Group 6	716	91	12.7	716	177	24.7

Census Block Group	2013 Total Population	Minority Population	Minority (Percent)	Population for Whom Poverty Status is Determined	Individuals Below Poverty Level	Individuals Below Poverty Level (Percent)
Census Tract 11, Block Group 7	714	120	16.8	714	241	33.8
Census Tract 12, Block Group 3	1,338	147	11.0	1,338	238	17.8
Census Tract 13, Block Group 1	977	35	3.6	977	210	21.5
Census Tract 13, Block Group 2	899	262	29.1	899	240	26.7
Census Tract 13, Block Group 3	752	150	19.9	752	88	11.7
Census Tract 13, Block Group 4	983	261	26.6	983	470	47.8
Census Tract 15.02, Block Group 2	934	129	13.8	934	58	6.2
Census Tract 15.02, Block Group 3	599	142	23.7	599	346	57.8
Census Tract 15.02, Block Group 4	1,602	525	32.8	1,541	215	14.0
Census Tract 15.02, Block Group 5	504	135	26.8	504	194	38.5
Census Tract 16, Block Group 2	881	47	5.3	881	68	7.7
Census Tract 16, Block Group 3	1,510	27	1.8	1,510	64	4.2
Census Tract 16, Block Group 4	1,470	263	17.9	1,465	167	11.4
Census Tract 16, Block Group 5	2,233	167	7.5	2,119	237	11.2
Census Tract 17, Block Group 1	535	0	0.0	535	58	10.8
Census Tract 17, Block Group 5	1,900	246	12.9	1,878	91	4.8
Census Tract 20.01, Block Group 1	847	150	17.7	819	218	26.6
Census Tract 20.01, Block Group 2	1,172	66	5.6	1,153	14	1.2
Census Tract 20.01, Block Group 3	1,083	49	4.5	1,058	36	3.4
Census Tract 20.02, Block Group 1	1,378	161	11.7	1,378	167	12.1
Census Tract 20.02, Block Group 2	1,294	208	16.1	1,294	156	12.1
Census Tract 20.02, Block Group 3	1,031	0	0.0	1,031	35	3.4
Census Tract 21, Block Group 3	1,164	209	18.0	651	115	17.7
Indirect Impacts Study Area Census Block Groups^b	45,371	7,777	17.1	44,444	9,075	20.4
Longview	36,656	6,759	18.4	35,938	8,133	22.6
Cowlitz County	102,110	14,896	14.6	100,782	17,750	17.6


Notes: Shading indicates a minority and/or low-income community.

^a Census Block Groups within 1 mile of the project areas.

^b Census Block Groups within 0.5 mile of affected rail lines in Cowlitz County.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2013

Figure 10. Minority and Low-Income Communities



2.2.3 Utilities

This section describes existing utility services that are provided to the project areas. This assessment focuses on water utilities, including potable water and wastewater service, and electrical utilities. Electricity and natural gas consumption are addressed in the SEPA Energy and Natural Resources Technical Report (ICF 2017a). For direct impacts on utilities, the study area is the project area and the area within 0.5 mile of the project area. For indirect impacts on utilities, the study area is the area within 0.5 mile of the project area.

An existing on-site industrial wastewater treatment facility and stormwater/wastewater collection and treatment system provides wastewater treatment to the project area. The Applicant replaced pre-existing sanitary sewer collection and treatment systems with a new collection system and connection to the Longview sewer system (URS Corporation 2014). With the new connection, the project area sewage flows are conveyed to the Three Rivers Regional Treatment Plant. This wastewater treatment plant has a design capacity of 26.0 million gallons per day (Washington State Department of Ecology 2012). From 2001 to 2009, the plant received an average wet weather flow (typically the highest rate) of 3.04 million gallons per day (Kelso 2011).

The Mint Farm Regional Water Treatment Plant supplies drinking water to more than 45,000 people in the Longview area. Groundwater is tapped from wells in the Mint Farm Industrial Park, and the water plant consists of four high capacity (4,000 gallons per minute) groundwater wells. The project area receives potable water from Longview through a connection on Industrial Way. This water is for domestic usage such as in sinks and toilets in the existing facilities (URS Corporation 2014).

In addition, the project area includes on-site stormwater ponds that provide water for dust control and other production needs. The stormwater ponds are supplemented with groundwater well withdrawals during dry periods (URS Corporation 2014).

The Cowlitz Public Utility District provides electricity service to the project area. The project area also includes two Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) parcels. One parcel includes high-power transmission lines and the second parcel includes a power substation with an access road.

This chapter describes the impacts on social and community resources that would result from construction and operation of the Proposed Action or the ongoing activities of the No-Action Alternative.

3.1 Proposed Action

Potential impacts on social/community cohesion and public services, minority and low-income populations, and utilities that could result from the Proposed Action are described below.

3.1.1 Social/Community Cohesion and Public Services

Direct impacts on social and community cohesion would occur when a project divides a neighborhood, isolates part of a neighborhood, or separates residents from public services by changing travel patterns or accessibility. Direct impacts on public services would occur when a project physically displaces or alters a public service facility.

Indirect impacts on social and community cohesion would occur when a project generates substantial new development or changes property values. Indirect impacts on public services would occur when a project introduces a new population or service demand that affects the services delivered by a community facility.

3.1.1.1 Construction: Direct Impacts

Construction of the Proposed Action would not result in any direct impacts on social and community cohesion or public services. Construction activities would be limited to the project area, and therefore would not divide or isolate neighborhoods or disrupt community cohesion. Furthermore, there are no public services (as defined in Section 2.2.1.2, *Public Services*) on or adjacent to the project area and, therefore, the Proposed Action would not physically displace or alter any public services during construction.

In some cases, construction can also affect a community by temporarily lowering property values during construction. For example, potential buyers may find a property less attractive if views are altered by the visible and audible presence of construction equipment and activity. However, views of the project area from nearby residential locations are limited, and these views already include the active industrial use currently on the project area (ICF and BergerABAM 2017). Furthermore, construction-related effects would be temporary, lasting only for the duration of these activities.

3.1.1.2 Construction: Indirect Impacts

Construction materials would be delivered to the project area by truck or rail (truck scenario and rail scenario). As described in the SEPA Vehicle Transportation Technical Report, construction activities would not adversely affect vehicle delay at grade crossings on the Reynolds Lead, BNSF Spur, and BNSF main line because average vehicle delay would not substantially change during

construction, except during the peak traffic hour at two public at-grade crossings on the Reynolds Lead under the rail scenario (ICF 2017b). However, this vehicle delay impact would only occur if a Proposed Action-related construction train (average of 1.3 train trips per day) passes during the peak traffic hour. If a public service vehicle arrives at the same time as a Proposed Action-related train along the Reynolds Lead, it would experience an approximate 9-minute delay. Therefore, vehicle delay during construction of the Proposed Action would have negligible impacts on social and community cohesion and access to public services.

Construction of the Proposed Action under the rail scenario would increase delay for pedestrian and bicycle travel as described below.

Affect Pedestrian and Bicyclist Travel

Proposed Action-related construction trains under the rail delivery scenario would cause pedestrian and bicyclist delay at at-grade crossings if pedestrians or bicyclists are blocked by a Proposed Action-related construction train. Alternative routes would require out-of-direction travel. The amount of delay would depend on when a pedestrian or bicyclist arrives at the crossing. If a pedestrian or bicyclist arrives at the same time as a Proposed Action-related construction train, they could experience approximately 9 minutes of delay at the public at-grade crossings along the Reynolds Lead. Pedestrians and bicyclists could also be affected by motor vehicle congestion and queuing at intersections adjacent to the at-grade crossings. Vehicle queuing at at-grade crossings could spill into the adjacent intersections and reduce or block sight distance for pedestrians and bicyclists. There would be no change in delay to pedestrian and bicycle travel at at-grade crossings on the Reynolds Lead if construction materials are delivered by truck (truck delivery scenario).

3.1.1.3 Operations: Direct Impacts

Because it would be confined to the project area, operation of the Proposed Action would not divide or isolate neighborhoods, nor would it lead to the displacement of substantial portions of the existing community. Operations also would not physically displace or alter any public service facility, but it would place new demands on fire protection services, as discussed below.

Place New Demands on Fire Protection Services

The Proposed Action would result in the operation of a large new industrial use on the project area. This alternative could result in new or different demands on fire protection services; however, required fire and life safety systems would be installed in the project area according to fire code standards. These systems would be regularly inspected and maintained. The Applicant would also maintain a surface water storage pond with a reserve of 0.36 million gallons at all times for fire suppression. In addition, Cowlitz 2 Fire & Rescue has been involved in a pre-fire planning process with the Applicant and has indicated that it will work with the Applicant to plan for the new facilities and operations (URS Corporation 2014).

3.1.1.4 Operations: Indirect Impacts

Operation of the Proposed Action would not result in indirect impacts on social and community cohesion because of changes to property values or by generating substantial new development. As noted above, the Proposed Action is located on an existing industrial site within a larger industrial area. Furthermore, the Proposed Action would use an existing freight rail line. Therefore, operation

of the Proposed Action would not constitute a new land use with the potential to change property values substantially or induce new development in the surrounding area.

In addition, operation of the Proposed Action is not expected to draw a substantial number of new employees and their families to the area. The Proposed Action would employ 135 workers, some of whom would be drawn from existing residents in the surrounding area. People who relocate to the area to fill a position are expected to reside anywhere in Cowlitz, Clark, Columbia, or Lewis counties, based on current commute patterns. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in a new population that could place new demands on public service providers such as educational facilities, police and emergency medical services, parks and recreation facilities, or libraries. However, operation of the Proposed Action would increase rail traffic-related noise along the Reynolds Lead and BNSF Spur due to sounding train horns. This increased rail traffic-related noise would result in increased noise levels within Archie Anderson Park near the Reynolds Lead and BNSF Spur. The operation of the Proposed Action could also result in vehicle and rail traffic that could affect accessibility to community resources and public resources within the study area community. Therefore, operation of the Proposed Action would result in the following indirect impacts.

Affect Accessibility to Community Resources and Public Resources

As described in the SEPA Vehicle Transportation Technical Report, Proposed Action-related trains would not adversely affect daily average vehicle delay at public at-grade crossings on the Reynolds Lead, BNSF Spur, and BNSF main line because average vehicle delay would not change substantially (ICF 2017b). Peak traffic hour vehicle delay would also not be adversely affected if track improvements are made to the Reynolds Lead and BNSF Lead (as described in the SEPA Rail Transportation Technical Report [ICF 2017c]) and only one Proposed Action-related train travels during the peak traffic hour. Therefore, under these scenarios, accessibility to social and community resources and public resources would not change substantially under the Proposed Action.

However, if two Proposed Action trains travel during the peak traffic hour, or infrastructure improvements are not made to the Reynolds Lead and BNSF Spur (as described in the SEPA Rail Transportation Technical Report [ICF 2017c]), vehicle delay would substantially change at some public at-grade crossings along the Reynolds Lead, BNSF Spur, and BNSF main line during the peak traffic hour (see the SEPA Vehicle Transportation Technical Report (ICF 2017b) for the identification of crossings and discussion of vehicle delay impacts). These vehicle delay impacts would be temporary (limited to the peak traffic hour) and the probability for two trains to pass during the peak vehicle traffic hour would be low. Under these scenarios, Proposed Action-related trains would indirectly affect the accessibility to community resources and public services at selected public at-grade crossings on the Reynolds Lead, BNSF Spur, and BNSF main line.

The owner of the Reynolds Lead and BNSF Spur has indicated that track improvements would be made, though these plans have not been submitted or permitted.

Affect Pedestrian and Bicyclist Travel

Proposed Action-related trains would cause pedestrian and bicyclist delay at at-grade crossings if pedestrians or bicyclists are blocked by a Proposed Action-related train. Alternative routes would require out-of-direction travel. The amount of delay would depend on when a pedestrian or bicyclist arrives at the crossing. If a pedestrian or bicyclist arrives at the same time as a

Proposed Action-related train, they could experience approximately 10 minutes of delay at the public at-grade crossings along the Reynolds Lead with current track infrastructure. Pedestrians and bicyclists could also be affected by motor vehicle congestion and queuing at intersections adjacent to the at-grade crossings. Vehicle queuing at at-grade crossings could spill into the adjacent intersections and reduce or block sight distance for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Increased Noise Levels in Archie Anderson Park, Highlands Trail, and Gerhart Gardens Park

Proposed Action-related trains would increase rail traffic-related noise levels in Archie Anderson Park, along the Highlands Trail, and in Gerhart Gardens Park, all of which are located within 1,000 feet the Reynolds Lead or BNSF Spur. The increased noise levels could reduce the attractiveness of the features in these parks that are more sensitive to increased noise levels, such as picnic facilities and sitting areas. Archie Anderson Park, the Highlands Trail, and Gerhart Gardens also include features that are not particularly sensitive to increased noise levels (e.g., facilities that are used for sports, exercise, or active play), such as walking and running trails, baseball fields, and basketball courts.

Increased noise levels would occur because Proposed Action-related trains would be required to sound their horns for public safety at at-grade crossings per Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) regulations.

3.1.2 Minority and Low-Income Populations

3.1.2.1 Summary of Adverse Impacts

The various technical reports present the impacts resulting from construction and operation of the Proposed Action.

For some resource areas, the Proposed Action would not result in adverse impacts. In others, it would result in low or minor impacts that would be avoided or minimized with standard best management practices or other mitigation measures, or would result in impacts that occur within a global context (e.g., climate change and greenhouse gas emissions). The Proposed Action would not have the potential to result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations in these resource areas. These are listed below.

- Climate Change
- Coal
- Energy and Natural Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazardous Materials
- Land and Shoreline Use
- Rail Safety
- Rail Transportation
- Social and Community Resources

- Surface Water and Floodplains
- Vegetation
- Vessel Transportation
- Water Quality
- Wildlife

The Proposed Action would result in adverse impacts in the other resource areas. These impacts are summarized below. An analysis of the Proposed Action's potential for disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations is provided in the next section.

- **Aesthetics, Light, and Glare.** The Proposed Action would result in adverse impacts related to changes in the visual features of the project area during construction and operation and the introduction of new sources of light and glare during operation (see the SEPA Aesthetics, Light, and Glare Technical Report [ICF and BergerABAM 2017]). As discussed in the SEPA Final EIS (Volume I), the co-lead agencies and the Applicant developed mitigation measures to address the adverse impacts related to light and glare.
- **Air Quality.** Based on an inhalation-only health risk assessment performed using the AERMOD dispersion model, described in the SEPA Air Quality Technical Report (ICF 2017h), Proposed Action-related diesel particulate matter emissions would result in increased cancer risk in the study area. The maximum modeled cancer risk increase in the City of Longview would be 50 cancers per million.
- **Cultural Resources.** The Proposed Action would demolish identified resources that contribute to the historical significance of the Reynolds Metals Reduction Plant Historic District. The Reynolds Metals Reduction Plant Historic District has been determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as a historic district. Demolition of the Reynolds Metals Reduction Plant Historic District would be an unavoidable and significant adverse environmental impact. The Memorandum of Agreement currently being negotiated among the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Cowlitz County, the Washington State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the Applicant is intended to resolve this impact in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).
- **Tribal Resources.** Operation of the Proposed Action would result in the transport of Proposed Action-related trains along the BNSF main line adjacent to the Columbia River. Rail transport could result in delays to tribal fishers' access to traditional fishing sites and delivery of fish to buyers. However, Proposed Action-related trains would be approximately 1.3 miles long and the time each train is at a crossing would range from approximately 8 minutes at 10 miles per hour to 1.75 minutes if the train is traveling at 50 miles per hour. Construction and operation of the Proposed Action would also result in indirect impacts on tribal resources through activities causing physical or behavioral responses in fish, and by affecting aquatic habitat. These impacts could affect the number of fish available for harvest by the tribes.
- **Fish.** During construction, the Proposed Action would result in direct adverse impacts on fish related to the loss of aquatic habitat due to pile placement, increased underwater noise during pile driving, increased shading, and potential spills or leaks. During operation, the Proposed Action would result in direct impacts related to increased shading, potential spills or leaks, coal spills, and vessel noise, and indirect impacts related to fish stranding from vessel wakes, maintenance dredging, coal dust and spills, and commercial and recreational fishing (see the

SEPA Fish Technical Report regarding both impacts [ICF 2017e].). As discussed in the SEPA Final EIS (Volume I), the co-lead agencies developed proposed mitigation measures to address the potential adverse impacts on fish.

- **Geology and Soils.** The Proposed Action would result in adverse impacts related to soil erosion and compaction and seismic-related events such as ground shaking and liquefaction (see the SEPA Geology and Soils Technical Report [ICF 2017f]). These would be direct impacts affecting the project area; this alternative would not result in indirect impacts on areas away from the project area. The Applicant has committed to implementing measures during construction to avoid and minimize geology and soils-related impacts.
- **Groundwater.** Construction of the Proposed Action would result in potential direct impacts to groundwater quality due to accidental leaks and spills or the displacement of contaminated groundwater through the use of vertical wick drains during construction preloading (see the SEPA Groundwater Technical Report [ICF 2017g]). As discussed in the SEPA Groundwater Technical Report, the co-lead agencies developed proposed Applicant mitigation measures to address the potential adverse impacts on groundwater. Operation of the Proposed Action would result in indirect impacts to groundwater quality because of accidental collision or derailment. If a release of hazardous materials were to occur, the rail operator would implement emergency response and cleanup actions as required by Occupational Safety and Health Administration rules (29 CFR 1910.120), the Washington State Oil and Hazardous Substance Spill Prevention and Response regulations (90.56 RCW), and the Model Toxic Control Act Cleanup Regulations (Chapter 173-340 WAC). The Proposed Action would not result in adverse impacts to groundwater supply or recharge [ICF 2017g].
- **Noise and Vibration.** The Proposed Action would result in potential adverse noise impacts during construction at one residence (104 Bradford Place, adjacent to the Proposed Action project area; see the SEPA Noise and Vibration Technical Report [ICF 2017d]).

During operations, the Proposed Action would result in a potential direct noise impact because terminal activities would result in noise levels exceeding the applicable state limit for nighttime noise levels (see the SEPA Noise and Vibration Technical Report [ICF 2017d]). The predicted noise level during operations is likely comparable to the current nighttime noise level. Proposed Action-related trains would result in potential adverse indirect noise impacts during operation at residences along the Reynolds Lead (near 3rd Avenue and California Way, Oregon Way and Industrial Way, and Douglas Street and Washington Way). Noise levels would exceed FRA guidelines for moderate or severe noise impacts at 289 residential units (see the SEPA Noise and Vibration Technical Report [ICF 2017d]). This impact would occur because of Proposed Action-related trains sounding their horns for public safety at grade crossings. As discussed in the SEPA Final EIS (Volume I), the co-lead agencies and the Applicant developed mitigation measures to address the adverse impacts related to noise.

- **Vehicle Transportation.** Construction of the Proposed Action would result in indirect vehicle delay impacts during the peak traffic hour at two public at-grade crossings on the Reynolds Lead under the rail delivery scenario. This vehicle delay impact would only occur if a Proposed Action-related train (average of 1.3 train trips per day) passes during the peak traffic hour and would be temporary. Operation of the Proposed Action would result in indirect impacts to vehicle transportation if two Proposed Action trains travel during the peak hour, or infrastructure improvements are not made to the Reynolds Lead and BNSF Spur (SEPA Rail Transportation Technical Report [ICF 2017c]). In these cases, vehicle delay would substantially

change at some public at-grade crossings along the Reynolds Lead, BNSF Spur, and BNSF main line during the peak traffic hour (see the SEPA Vehicle Transportation Technical Report for the identification of crossings [ICF 2017b]). This vehicle delay impact would only occur if two Proposed Action-related trains traveled during the peak traffic hour or if track improvements are not made. Emergency medical services and fire protection response times would also be affected by increased delay at at-grade crossings because of the Proposed Action. The Applicant will implement a variety of voluntary measures and mitigation to address vehicle delay, vehicle safety, and emergency response impacts, as discussed in the SEPA Final EIS (Volume I).

3.1.2.2 Analysis of the Potential for Disproportionately High and Adverse Effects

In accordance with CEQ guidance, the determination of the Proposed Action's potential to result in disproportionately high and adverse effects involved consideration of whether the adverse impact is considered significant (as employed by NEPA); whether the effects on minority or low-income populations would appreciably exceed, or would be likely to appreciably exceed, the risk or rate to the general population; and whether the minority or low-income population would be affected by cumulative or multiple adverse exposures from environmental hazards. The determination of disproportionately high and adverse effects also involved consideration of proposed mitigation measures and offsetting benefits.

The potential adverse impacts identified in Section 3.1.2.1, *Summary of Adverse Impacts*, were analyzed for their potential to result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations. The co-lead agencies concluded that the Proposed Action's indirect impacts related to noise, vehicle delay along the Reynolds Lead, and diesel particulate matter inhalation risk would affect minority or low-income communities at a rate that would appreciably exceed the rate of risk for the general population. Refer to Chapter 3, Section 3.2, *Social and Community Resources*, in the SEPA Final EIS (Volume I) for a discussion of these potential disproportionate impacts.

The following analysis evaluates the other potential adverse impacts for their potential to result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations. The analysis concludes that the other potential adverse impacts would not result in disproportionately high and adverse effects.

- **Aesthetics, Light, and Glare.** The assessment of aesthetics, light, and glare considered three primary types of views: urban/industrial views, rural/residential views, and natural views. The Proposed Action would result in no impact or low impacts on urban/industrial views and rural/residential views. Furthermore, urban/industrial views are primarily experienced by workers and commuters, who would include both minority/low-income populations and non-minority/non-low-income populations. Therefore, the low level of impacts on urban/industrial views and rural/residential views would not have the potential to result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and/or low-income populations. The Proposed Action would result in a potential moderate level of impact on natural views from Dibblee Point Beach. However, this viewpoint is a public park, and therefore minority and low-income populations would not bear a disproportionately high and adverse share of the impact. Overall, the Proposed Action's potential adverse aesthetics impacts would not result in disproportionately high or adverse effects on minority or low-income populations.
- **Cultural Resources.** The unavoidable and significant adverse environmental impact related to the demolition of the Reynolds Metals Reduction Plant Historic District would be a direct impact

affecting the project area. Because these impacts would not affect the public, they would not result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority or low-income populations. In addition, the Memorandum of Agreement currently being negotiated among the Corps, Cowlitz County, the SHPO, and the Applicant is intended to resolve this impact.

- **Tribal Resources.** The adverse impacts related to tribal resources would only affect tribal communities, and would therefore disproportionately affect minority populations. However, the adverse impacts would not be disproportionately high. The Proposed Action would introduce 8 loaded trains per day to the BNSF main line adjacent to the Columbia River. These trains would take a maximum of approximately 8 minutes per train to pass a tribal fishing access grade crossing. It is unlikely that an individual would be affected by more than one train per day. Eight additional minutes of delay for access to or from a fishing site would not be disproportionately high. The adverse impacts to tribal fish resources would be reduced by compliance with laws and the implementation of the voluntary measures and mitigation measures identified in Chapter 4, Section 4.7, *Fish*, of the SEPA Final EIS (Volume I).
- **Fish.** The potential adverse impacts related to fish would primarily affect biological communities, not human populations and the public. Furthermore, the increase in vessel traffic resulting from the Proposed Action would not likely reduce the catch from commercial or recreational fishing or limit access for commercial or recreational fishing activities. Therefore, the Proposed Action's potential adverse impacts to fish resources would not have the potential to result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority or low-income populations.
- **Geology and Soils.** As noted above, the potential adverse geologic impacts would be direct impacts affecting the project area. Because these impacts would not affect the public (i.e., they could affect employees on site but not off-site residents), they would not result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority or low-income populations.
- **Groundwater.** Although the Proposed Action would result in potential adverse impacts associated with the displacement of contaminated groundwater with vertical wick drains during construction preloading, the permeability of the earth materials affected by preloading would be relatively low and thus would not be particularly susceptible to the infiltration of contaminated groundwater. Furthermore, the groundwater in the project area is not used as a source of drinking water and has a severely limited potential to affect sources of drinking water. Therefore, any potential contamination of groundwater at the project area would have limited potential to affect the public. Overall, the potential adverse impacts on groundwater would not result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority or low-income populations.

3.1.2.3 Public Participation

Executive Order 12898 requires federal agencies to work to ensure greater public participation in the decision-making process. In addition, CEQ guidance suggests that federal agencies should acknowledge and seek to overcome linguistic, cultural, institutional, geographic, and other barriers to meaningful participation.

Cowlitz County, the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (the co-lead agencies) have engaged in a robust public outreach effort. The primary components of this effort are the two formal comment periods required by the NEPA and SEPA EIS processes: (1) the scoping phase comment period and (2) the Draft EIS comment period. A public involvement plan developed for the SEPA process guided the public outreach effort.

Prior to the scoping meeting, stakeholder interviews were conducted to guide planning for the scoping process. These interviews were conducted with stakeholders representing a diverse range of interests and demographics including city and county jurisdictions, environmental and conservation groups, landowner organizations, labor organizations, economic development and business organizations, port authorities, river navigation pilots, and local community groups. A project website was also developed (www.millenniumbulkeiswa.gov/), providing information in English and Spanish. This website serves as an information hub, a public comment portal, and a document review and download repository throughout development of the EIS. The website was promoted in news releases, ads in local media, and printed project information.

The public scoping meetings for the Proposed Action were announced in various publications. Notices were published in the *Federal Register* and Washington State Register, and the co-lead agencies issued a press release. Display ads were placed in local newspapers where scoping meetings were held, including *The Spokane Spokesman-Review*, *The Tri-City Herald* (Pasco), *The Columbian* (Vancouver/Clark County), *The Longview Daily News*, and *The Tacoma News-Tribune*. Announcements were also sent to a listserv group, and an informational flyer was mailed to 6,000 residents in neighborhoods near the Proposed Action project area, including the Highlands neighborhood in Longview. A Spanish translation of the informational flyer was also distributed.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers conducted two scoping meetings for NEPA EIS comments, and Cowlitz County and Ecology held five meetings to receive SEPA-related scoping comments. The NEPA-related scoping meetings were held on September 17, 2013, in Longview and on October 9, 2013, in Clark County. The SEPA-related scoping meetings were held on September 17, 2013, in Longview; September 25, 2013, in Spokane; October 1, 2013, in Pasco; October 9, 2013, in Clark County; and October 17, 2013, in Tacoma. All meetings used an open-house format to provide EIS process information and details about the proposed action, and to receive scoping comments. In total, the co-lead agencies received over 215,400 scoping comments. Spanish-language handouts and Spanish translation services were available at each meeting. All facilities were Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-accessible.

Cowlitz County and Ecology held three public hearings to receive comments on the SEPA Draft EIS. The public hearings were held at the following dates and locations.

- May 24, 2016, in Longview
- May 26, 2016, in Spokane
- June 2, 2016, in Pasco

Each public hearing included an open house, which allowed the public to interact with agency representatives and to access information about the SEPA EIS process as well as details about the Proposed Action. Spanish-language handouts and Spanish translation services were available at each public hearing. All facilities were Americans with Disabilities Act-accessible. In total, the co-lead agencies received approximately 267,000 comments during the Draft EIS comment period. Volume IV of the Final EIS includes responses to comments on the Draft EIS.

3.1.2.4 Conclusion

Given all the facts and circumstances, the Proposed Action is expected to result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations related to noise from rail operations, vehicle delay along the Reynolds Lead, and diesel particulate matter

inhalation risk. Refer to Chapter 3, Section 3.2, *Social and Community Resources*, in the SEPA Final EIS (Volume I) for a discussion of these potential disproportionate impacts.

3.1.3 Utilities

3.1.3.1 Construction: Direct Impacts

Construction of the Proposed Action is not anticipated to result in direct impacts on water and sewer service. Construction activities would use groundwater for dust suppression and would not affect water utility service. Construction practices would ensure that the water supply and sewer connections are not disrupted for surrounding users.

Affect BPA-Owned Parcels

If the Applicant obtains an easement from BPA, construction of the Proposed Action would affect two BPA-owned parcels within the project area. One parcel has power transmission lines and the second parcel has a substation. The Applicant would coordinate with BPA on potential impacts to BPA infrastructure and operations.

3.1.3.2 Construction: Indirect Impacts

Demand for water and sewer utility services during construction of the Proposed Action would be confined to activities in the project area. Construction of the Proposed Action would not result in new indirect demands on water supply, sewer utility services, or wastewater treatment. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Action would not result in indirect impacts on utilities.

3.1.3.3 Operations: Direct Impacts

The Proposed Action could directly affect water and sewer utilities and electrical utilities. Operation of the Proposed Action would result in the following direct impacts.

Affect BPA-Owned Parcels

If the Applicant obtains an easement from BPA, operation of the Proposed Action would be located on two BPA-owned parcels within the project area. The Applicant would coordinate with BPA on potential impacts to BPA infrastructure and operations.

Create New Sanitary Sewage Flows from the Project Area

As noted above, the project area and the Applicant's leased area are served by a sanitary sewer collection system and connection to the Longview sewer system. A new sanitary sewer conveyance system and connection to the City of Longview sewer system would be developed under the Proposed Action. New sanitary sewer flows from the Proposed Action would be small and would be offset by the reduction in flows from the existing uses in the project area. The Three Rivers Wastewater Treatment Plant has sufficient capacity to treat additional wastewater flows. The Applicant would be required to obtain a permit to discharge wastewater, as described in Chapter 4, *Required Permits*.

The Proposed Action would not convey industrial process wastewater to the City of Longview sewer system or the Three Rivers Wastewater Treatment Plant. Industrial process wastewater

would be treated in the on-site water treatment facility and would not add new demands to public sewer and wastewater utilities.

Create New Water Demand on the Project Area

The Proposed Action would use potable municipal water supplies for domestic uses, such as drinking, sinks, and toilets. This alternative would not use potable water supplies for industrial needs. Therefore, the Proposed Action would result in a small increase in demand for potable water (185 gallons per minute) compared to the overall capacity of the City of Longview water supply (16,000 gallons per minute).

Non-potable water would be used for industrial processes such as dust control, stockpile sprays, wash down, clean up, and fire protection. This water would be supplied by treated water from the proposed water management system and storage ponds and supplemented by wells during dry seasons. Therefore, the Proposed Action industrial water use would not place new demands on the City of Longview water supply.

3.1.3.4 Operations: Indirect Impacts

The Proposed Action would not result in indirect impacts on water and sewer utilities because demand for these utilities would be limited to the project area.

3.2 No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative, the Applicant would not construct the proposed export terminal. The Applicant would continue with current and future increased operations in the project area. The project area could be developed for other industrial uses including an expanded bulk product terminal or other industrial uses. The Applicant has indicated that, over the long term, it would expand the existing bulk product terminal and develop new facilities to handle more products such as calcine petroleum coke, coal tar pitch, and cement.

3.2.1 Social/Community Cohesion and Public Services

Construction activity under the No-Action Alternative would not result in direct impacts on social and community cohesion or public services. Construction activities would be limited to the project area, and therefore would not divide or isolate neighborhoods or disrupt community cohesion.

Operation of the No-Action Alternative would not divide or isolate neighborhoods because any new facilities would be constructed on an existing industrial site within a wide corridor of similar industrial uses, and operations would not physically displace or alter any public service facility. Therefore, operation of the No-Action Alternative would not result in direct impacts on social and community cohesion and public services.

Operation of the No-Action Alternative would not result in indirect impacts on social and community cohesion because of changes to property values or by generating substantial new development. The No-Action Alternative is located on an existing industrial site within a larger industrial area, and would use an existing freight rail line. Therefore, operation of the No-Action Alternative would not constitute a new land use with the potential to change property values substantially or induce new development in the surrounding area. In addition, the No-Action Alternative would not result in the

introduction of a new population that could place demands on public service providers. The No-Action Alternative would not be expected to affect vehicle delay, and therefore, would not affect social and community cohesion and public services.

3.2.2 Minority and Low-Income Populations

The No-Action Alternative would increase rail operations along the Reynolds Lead. Noise levels under the No-Action Alternative would be higher than under existing conditions, but would not result in noise impacts, as described in the SEPA Noise and Vibration Technical Report (ICF 2017d). The No-Action Alternative would not result in peak hour vehicle delay impacts on the Reynolds Lead, nor would it cause a substantial change in air quality or adversely affect nearby populations. Impacts on other environmental resource areas under the No-Action Alternative would generally be similar to or less than impacts under the Proposed Action. Therefore, the No-Action Alternative would not have disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations.

3.2.3 Utilities

Construction of the No-Action Alternative is not anticipated to result in direct impacts on water and sewer service. Operation of the No-Action Alternative could result in new sanitary sewage flows and new water demand from the project area. The Three Rivers Wastewater Treatment Plant has sufficient capacity to treat additional wastewater flows, and it is expected that any new demand for potable water would be small compared to the capacity of the Longview water supply. Water used for industrial purposes, such as dust control, would continue to be drawn from stormwater ponds and supplemented with groundwater well withdrawals during dry periods.

Chapter 4 Required Permits

No permits would be required in relation to social/community cohesion and public services or minority and low-income populations for the Proposed Action. Permits would be required be required for water utilities, as described below.

The Proposed Action would require the following permits related to water utilities.

- **Wastewater Discharge Permit—Three Rivers Regional Wastewater Authority.** This permit would be required to discharge wastewater to the Three River Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant. A survey form would be completed first to allow the Three Rivers Regional Wastewater Authority to determine whether a permit is required.
- **Permit for Utility Service—City of Longview.** The project area receives potable water from the City of Longview through a connection on Industrial Way. This permit would be required to receive water service and to convey wastewater flows via the City of Longview’s system.

Chapter 5 References

- American Medical Response. 2015. *Cowlitz County*. Available: <http://www.amr.net/Locations/Operations/Washington/Cowlitz-County>. Accessed: May 21, 2015.
- City of Longview. 2006. *City of Longview 2006 Comprehensive Plan*. December 2006. Planning Division. Longview, WA. Available: <http://mylongview.com/index.aspx?page=493>.
- City of Longview. 2007. *Neighborhood Areas in Longview*. Available: <http://www.mylongview.com/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=34>. Accessed: May 21, 2015.
- Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. *Environmental Justice Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act*. Executive Office of the President. Washington, D.C.
- Cowlitz 2 Fire & Rescue. 2015. *Welcome to Cowlitz 2 Fire & Rescue*. Available: <http://www.c2fr.org/general.html>. Accessed: May 21, 2015.
- Cowlitz County Department of Building and Planning. 2015. *Cowlitz County Comprehensive Plan Update*. Draft April 16, 2015. Planning Division. Available: <http://www.co.cowlitz.wa.us/DocumentCenter/View/7329>. Accessed October 19, 2015.
- Cowlitz on the Move. No date. *The Trails of Cowlitz County*. Available: <http://www.cowlitzonthemove.org/pdfs/Trail%20Map.pdf>. Accessed: May 21, 2015.
- ICF. 2017a. *Millennium Bulk Terminals—Longview, SEPA Environmental Impact Statement, SEPA Energy and Natural Resources Technical Report*. April. Seattle, WA. Prepared for Cowlitz County, Kelso, WA, in cooperation with Washington State Department of Ecology, Southwest Region.
- ICF. 2017b. *Millennium Bulk Terminals—Longview, SEPA Environmental Impact Statement, SEPA Vehicle Transportation Technical Report*. April. Seattle, WA. Prepared for Cowlitz County, Kelso, WA, in cooperation with Washington State Department of Ecology, Southwest Region.
- ICF. 2017c. *Millennium Bulk Terminals—Longview, SEPA Environmental Impact Statement, SEPA Rail Transportation Technical Report*. April. Seattle, WA. Prepared for Cowlitz County, Kelso, WA, in cooperation with Washington State Department of Ecology, Southwest Region.
- ICF. 2017d. *Millennium Bulk Terminals—Longview, SEPA Environmental Impact Statement, SEPA Noise and Vibration Technical Report*. April. Seattle, WA. Prepared for Cowlitz County, Kelso, WA, in cooperation with Washington State Department of Ecology, Southwest Region.
- ICF. 2017e. *Millennium Bulk Terminals—Longview, SEPA Environmental Impact Statement, SEPA Fish Technical Report*. April. Seattle, WA. Prepared for Cowlitz County, Kelso, WA, in cooperation with Washington State Department of Ecology, Southwest Region.
- ICF. 2017f. *Millennium Bulk Terminals—Longview, SEPA Environmental Impact Statement, SEPA Geology and Soils Technical Report*. April. Seattle, WA. Prepared for Cowlitz County, Kelso, WA, in cooperation with Washington State Department of Ecology, Southwest Region.

- ICF. 2017g. *Millennium Bulk Terminals—Longview, SEPA Environmental Impact Statement, SEPA Groundwater Technical Report*. April. Seattle, WA. Prepared for Cowlitz County, Kelso, WA, in cooperation with Washington State Department of Ecology, Southwest Region.
- ICF. 2017h. *Millennium Bulk Terminals—Longview, SEPA Environmental Impact Statement, SEPA Air Quality Technical Report*. April. Seattle, WA. Prepared for Cowlitz County, Kelso, WA, in cooperation with Washington State Department of Ecology, Southwest Region.
- ICF and BergerABAM. 2017. *Millennium Bulk Terminals—Longview, SEPA Environmental Impact Statement, SEPA Aesthetics, Light, and Glare Technical Report*. April. Seattle, WA. Prepared for Cowlitz County, Kelso, WA, in cooperation with Washington State Department of Ecology, Southwest Region.
- Kelso. 2011. *General Sewer and Facilities Plan*. Prepared by Gibbs & Olson. Kelso, WA.
- River Cities Transit. 2015. *System Map*. Available: <http://rctransit.org/systemmap/>. Accessed: May 21, 2015.
- URS Corporation. 2014. *Public Services and Utilities Resource Report*. Longview, WA. Prepared for Millennium Coal Export Terminal.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. Census 2000. Data generated using American FactFinder. Available: <http://factfinder2.census.gov>. Accessed: June 2015.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2010. Census 2010. Data generated using American FactFinder. Available: <http://factfinder2.census.gov>. Accessed: June 2015.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2013. 2009-2013 American Community 5-Year Estimates. Data generated using American FactFinder. Available: <http://factfinder2.census.gov>. Accessed: June 2015.
- Washington State Department of Ecology. 2012. *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Waste Discharge Permit No. WA0037788*. Olympia, WA.
- Washington State Office of Financial Management. 2012. *2012 Projections County Growth Management Population Projections by Age and Sex: 2010–2040*. Forecast Division. Available: http://www.ofm.wa.gov/pop/gma/projections12/GMA_2012_county_pop_projections.pdf. Accessed: May 2015.

Appendix A

Public Service Facilities in the Study Areas

Appendix A

Public Service Facilities in the Study Areas

Map No.	Name	Type	Address
1	Woodland Public Schools (Office of the Superintendent)	Educational Facility	800 Third Street, Woodland, WA 98674
2	Industrial Training International	Educational Facility	9428 Old Pacific Highway, Woodland, WA 98674
3	WSU Cowlitz County Extension	Educational Facility	1946 3rd Avenue, Longview, WA 98632
4	Woodland Primary School	Educational Facility	600 Bozarth Avenue, Woodland, WA 98674
5	Woodland High School	Educational Facility	757 Park Street, Woodland, WA 98674
6	Kalama Elementary	Educational Facility	548 China Garden Road, Kalama, WA 98625
7	Kalama Middle/High Schools	Educational Facility	548 China Garden Road, Kalama, WA 98625
8	Carrolls Elementary School	Educational Facility	3902 Old Pacific Highway, Kelso, WA 98626
9	St. Helens Elementary School	Educational Facility	431 27th Avenue, Longview, WA 98632
10	Huntington Middle School	Educational Facility	500 Redpath, Kelso, WA 98626
11	Caitlin Elementary	Educational Facility	404 Long Avenue West, Kelso, WA 98626
12	Barnes Elementary	Educational Facility	401 Barnes Street, Kelso, WA 98626
13	Castle Rock Elementary School	Educational Facility	700 Huntington Avenue S, Castle Rock, WA 98611
14	Castle Rock Middle School	Educational Facility	615 Front Avenue SW, Castle Rock, WA 98611
15	Castle Rock High School	Educational Facility	5180 West Side Highway, Castle Rock, WA 98611
16	St. Philip Catholic Church	Religious Institution	430 Bozarth Avenue, Woodland, WA 98674
17	Woodland Presbyterian Church	Religious Institution	756 Park Street, Woodland, WA 98674
18	Woodland Christian Church	Religious Institution	430 Buckeye Street, Woodland, WA 98674
19	Jehovah's Witnesses Kingdom Hall	Religious Institution	7002 Green Mountain Road, Woodland, WA 98674
20	Kalama Baptist Church	Religious Institution	112 Vincent Road, Kalama, WA 98625
21	United Methodist Church	Religious Institution	111 North Second Street, Kalama, WA 98625
22	St Joseph Parish Hall	Religious Institution	696 Elm Street, Kalama, WA 98625
23	Church of God of Prophecy	Religious Institution	1008 Walnut Street, Kelso, WA 98626

Map No.	Name	Type	Address
24	Abundant Life Church of the Nazarene	Religious Institution	615 S Fourth Avenue, Kelso, WA 98626
25	Grace Bible Fellowship	Religious Institution	300 S 10th Avenue, Kelso, WA 98626
26	First Baptist Church of Kelso	Religious Institution	214 S Fourth Avenue, Kelso, WA 98626
27	First Presbyterian Church	Religious Institution	215 Academy Street, Kelso, WA 98626
28	First Assembly of God	Religious Institution	403 Academy Street, Kelso, WA 98626
29	Cowlitz Way Baptist Church	Religious Institution	600 Cowlitz Way, Kelso, WA 98626
30	Fellowship Assembly of God Church	Religious Institution	1517 Fourth Avenue N, Kelso, WA 98626
31	First United Methodist Church	Religious Institution	206 Cowlitz Way, Kelso, WA 98626
32	The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints	Religious Institution	2884 N Pacific Avenue, Kelso, WA 98626
33	St Mary Catholic Church	Religious Institution	120 Powell Road, Castle Rock, WA 98611
34	St Matthew's Episcopal Church	Religious Institution	412 Pioneer Avenue NE, Castle Rock, WA 98611
35	Castle Rock Seventh Day Church	Religious Institution	7531 Old Pacific Highway N, Castle Rock, WA 98611
36	Cloud Mountain Retreat Center	Religious Institution	373 Agren Road, Castle Rock, WA 98611
37	Longview Foursquare Church	Religious Institution	416 20th Avenue, Longview, WA 98632
38	Longview of Life	Religious Institution	420 17th Avenue, Longview, WA 98593
39	First Baptist Church-Longview	Religious Institution	747 Wheeler Street, Longview, WA 98632
40	Shekinah Christian Center	Religious Institution	1015 3rd Avenue, Longview, WA 98632
41	New Hope City Church	Religious Institution	203-1/2 Allen Street, Kelso, WA 98626
42	Faith Lutheran Brethren Church	Religious Institution	210 Fishers Lane, Kelso, WA 98626
43	Kelso-Longview Seventh Day Church	Religious Institution	77 Solomon Road, Kelso, WA 98626
44	The Rock Church	Religious Institution	1955 Huntington Avenue S, Castle Rock, WA 98611
45	St Paul Lutheran-ELCA	Religious Institution	312 1st Avenue SW, Castle Rock, WA 98611
46	Castle Rock United Methodist	Religious Institution	241 1st Avenue SW, Castle Rock, WA 98611
47	Apostolic Lutheran Church	Religious Institution	248 Cowlitz Street E, Castle Rock, WA 98611
48	Hulda Klager Lilac Gardens, Inc	Social Institution	115 S Pekin Road, Woodland, WA 98674

Map No.	Name	Type	Address
49	Woodland Community Services Center	Social Institution	736 Davidson Avenue, Woodland, WA 98674
50	Veterans of Foreign Wars	Social Institution	222 N 1st Street, Kalama, WA 98625
51	Veterans of Foreign Wars	Social Institution	434 Davidson Avenue, Woodland, WA 98674
52	Kalama Fair Grounds	Social Institution	172 Kalama River Road, Kelso, WA 98626
53	Elks Lodge	Social Institution	900 Ash Street, Kelso, WA 98626
54	Expo Center	Social Institution	1900 7th Avenue, Longview, WA 98632
55	Catlin Senior Center	Social Institution	106 8th Avenue NW, Kelso, WA 98626
56	Fraternal Order of Eagles	Social Institution	224 Huntington Avenue S, Castle Rock, WA 98611
57	Fraternal Order of Eagles	Social Institution	609 S Pacific Avenue, Kelso, WA 98626
58	Castle Rock Exhibit Hall	Social Institution	147 Front Avenue SW, Castle Rock, WA 98611
59	Castle Rock Fair Grounds	Social Institution	120 Firlane Road, Castle Rock, WA 98611
60	Woodland Dental Center	Medical Facility	640 Goerig Street, Woodland, WA 98674
61	Lewis River Dental	Medical Facility	500 Columbia Street, Woodland, WA 98674
62	Hilander Dental	Medical Facility	510 Allen Street, Kelso, WA 98626
63	Kaiser Permanente Longview-Kelso Medical Office	Medical Facility	1230 7th Avenue, Longview, WA 98632
64	PeaceHealth St. John Medical Center Behavioral Health Outpatient	Medical Facility	600 Broadway Street, Longview, WA 98632
65	Twin City Dental	Medical Facility	409 W Main Street, Kelso, WA 98626
66	Cowlitz River Dental	Medical Facility	358 Front Avenue NW, Castle Rock, WA 98611
67	Cowlitz Fire District #5	Fire Protection	382 NE Frontage Road, Kalama, WA 98625
68	Cowlitz Fire Department	Fire Protection	2300 Parrott Way, Kelso, WA 98626
69	Cowlitz 2 Fire & Rescue	Fire Protection	701 Vine Street, Kelso, WA 98626
70	Lexington Fire Department	Fire Protection	1796 Westside Highway, Kelso, WA 98626
71	Cowlitz County Fire District 6	Fire Protection	146 A Street SW, Castle Rock, WA 98611
72	Cowlitz County Fire Protection District 1	Fire Protection	160 Pinkerton Drive, Woodland, WA 98674
73	Woodland Fire Department	Fire Protection	100 Davidson Avenue, Woodland, WA 98674
74	City of Longview Fire Department	Fire Protection	740 Commerce Avenue, Longview, WA 98632
75	Woodland Police Department	Police Facility	200 East Scott Avenue, Woodland, WA 98674
76	Kalama Police Department	Police Facility	535 N 1st Street, Kalama, WA 98625
77	Washington State Patrol	Police Facility	1823 Baker Way, Kelso, WA 98626
78	Kelso Police Department	Police Facility	201 S Pacific Avenue, Kelso, WA 98626

Map No.	Name	Type	Address
79	Longview Police Department	Police Facility	216 30th Avenue, Longview, WA 98632
80	Cowlitz County Sheriff's Office	Police Facility	312 SW 1st Avenue #124, Kelso, WA 98626
81	Castle Rock Police Department	Police Facility	141 A Street, Castle Rock, WA 98611
82	Steele Chapel Funeral Home	Cemetery	5050 Mt Solo Road, Longview, WA 98632
83	Longview Memorial Park Cemetery	Cemetery	5050 Mt Solo Road, Longview, WA 98632
84	Mt Solo Cemetery	Cemetery	5050 Mt. Solo Road, Longview, WA 98632
85	Woodland Community Library	Library	770 Park Street, Woodland, WA 98674
86	Kelso Public Library - Three Rivers Mall	Library	351 Three Rivers Drive, Kelso, WA 98626
87	Castle Rock Public Library	Library	137 Cowlitz Street W, Castle Rock, WA 98611
88	Woodland City Clerk/Planning and Building	Other	230 Davidson Avenue, Woodland, WA 98674
89	Kalama Housing Authority	Other	226 Cloverdale Road, Kalama, WA 98625
90	Southwest Washington Regional Airport	Other	2215 Parrott Way, Kelso, WA 98626
91	Cowlitz County Public Works	Other	1600 13th Avenue S, Kelso, WA 98626
92	Housing Authority of Kelso	Other	1415 S 10th Avenue, Kelso, WA 98626
93	WorkSource	Other	305 S Pacific Avenue, Kelso, WA 98626
94	Kelso City Attorney/Building/Engineering/Planning	Other	203 S Pacific Avenue, Kelso, WA 98626
95	U.S. Post Office	Other	304 Academy Street, Kelso, WA 98626
96	Cowlitz County Commissioners/Building and Planning	Other	207 4th Avenue N, #305, Kelso, WA 98626
97	Social & Health Services Department	Other	711 Vine Street, Kelso, WA 98626
98	Emergency Support Shelter	Other	304 Cowlitz Way, Kelso, WA 98626
99	Cowlitz County Elections	Other	207 4th Avenue N, #107, Kelso, WA 98626
100	Agriculture Department	Other	2211 N Hendrickson Drive, Kalama, WA 98625
101	Cowlitz County-Landfill	Other	85 Tennant Way, Longview, WA 98632
102	Humane Society of Cowlitz County	Other	909 Columbia Blvd, Longview, WA 98632
103	Longview Park Maintenance	Other	706 30th Avenue, Longview, WA 98632
104	Longview Parks and Recreation Department	Other	2920 Douglas Street, Longview, WA 98632
105	Longview Work Training Release	Other	1821 1st Avenue, Longview, WA 98632
106	Cowlitz County Jail	Other	1935 1st Avenue, Longview, WA 98632
107	Castle Rock City Hall/Building/Planning/Treasurer/Community Revitalization	Other	141 SW A Street, Castle Rock, WA 98611

Map No.	Name	Type	Address
108	Castle Rock District Court	Other	312 SW First Avenue, Kelso, WA 98626
109	Cowlitz County Superior Court/District Court/Emergency Management	Other	312 SW 1st Avenue, Kelso, WA 98626
110	Cowlitz County Coroner	Other	1946-B 3rd Avenue, Longview, WA 98632
111	Cowlitz County Geographic Information Systems Department	Other	207 4th Avenue N, Kelso, WA 98626
112	City of Woodland Public Works Department	Other	300 East Scott Avenue, Woodland, WA 98674
113	City of Longview Parks Department	Other	706 30th Avenue, Longview, WA 98632
114	Castle Rock Public Works Department/Parks Department	Other	360 A Street SW, Castle Rock, WA 98611
115	Cowlitz County Historical Museum	Other	405 Allen Street, Kelso, WA 98626
116	Archie Anderson Park	Park/Recreation Facility	Alabama Street and 21st Street, Longview, WA 98632
117	Gerhardt Gardens Park	Park/Recreation Facility	40 Tennant Way, Longview, WA 98632
118	7th Avenue Park	Park/Recreation Facility	920 7th Avenue, Longview, WA 98632
119	Marine Park	Park/Recreation Facility	380 West Marine Drive, Kalama, WA 98625
120	Hoffman Park	Park/Recreation Facility	Buckeye Street and Park Street, Woodland, WA 98674
121	Horseshoe Lake Park	Park/Recreation Facility	Park Road and Goerig Street, Woodland, WA 98674
122	Rolling Freedom Skate Park	Park/Recreation Facility	Park Road and I-5, Woodland, WA 98674
123	Manasco Park	Park/Recreation Facility	South River Road and Hawthorne Street, Kelso, WA 98626
124	Catlin Hall Park	Park/Recreation Facility	NW 7th Avenue and W Main Street, Kelso, WA 98626
125	Catlin Spray Park	Park/Recreation Facility	NW 7th Avenue and W Main Street, Kelso, WA 98626
126	Lads and Lassies Park	Park/Recreation Facility	Elm Street and South 8th Street, Kelso, WA 98626
127	Kelso Commons Park	Park/Recreation Facility	Oak Street and South Pacific Avenue, Kelso, WA 98626
128	Cowlitz River Overlook	Park/Recreation Facility	1st Avenue South and Allen Street, Kelso, WA 98626
129	Cowlitz River Trail	Park/Recreation Facility	East bank of Cowlitz River, Kelso, WA 98626
130	Peter Crawford Home Site	Park/Recreation Facility	North Pacific Avenue and Academy Street, Kelso, WA 98626
131	Rhododendron Gardens	Park/Recreation Facility	North Kelso Avenue and Harris Street, Kelso, WA 98626
132	Triangle Park	Park/Recreation Facility	West Main Street and SW 6th Avenue, Kelso, WA 98626
133	Riverside County Park	Park/Recreation Facility	Westside Highway/SR 411 and Villa Street, Lexington, WA 98626
134	Lion's Pride Park	Park/Recreation Facility	1747 Huntington Avenue South, Castle Rock, WA 98611

Map No.	Name	Type	Address
135	The Rock	Park/Recreation Facility	Dike Road and Huntington Avenue South, Castle Rock, WA 98611
136	East and West Riverfront Trail	Park/Recreation Facility	East and West bank of Cowlitz River, Castle Rock, WA 98611
137	Harry S Truman Memorial Park	Park/Recreation Facility	Front Avenue NW and Mallory Street NE, Castle Rock, WA 98611

Source: Websites for Cowlitz County; the cities of Woodland, Kelso, Longview, and Castle Rock; Google Maps; and the public service facilities.

Appendix B

**Minority and Low-Income
Populations Demographic Data**

Minority and Low-Income Populations Demographic Data

Area	2013 Total Population	Race and Ethnicity ^a										Minority	Total Minority %	Percent of Individuals Below Poverty Level		
		White	%	Black	%	Asian and Pacific Islander	%	American Indian and Alaska Native	%	Other	%				Hispanic	%
Census Tract 3, Block Group 1 ^b	570	368	64.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.4	30	5.3	170	29.8	202	35.4	44.7
Census Tract 6.01, Block Group 3 ^b	1,025	590	57.6	0	0.0	110	10.7	0	0.0	135	13.2	190	18.5	435	42.4	32.0
Census Tract 6.01, Block Group 4	881	705	80.0	0	0.0	32	3.6	0	0.0	37	4.2	107	12.1	176	20.0	31.4
Census Tract 7.03, Block Group 1	1,373	1,166	84.9	0	0.0	14	1.0	9	0.7	58	4.2	126	9.2	207	15.1	23.7
Census Tract 7.04, Block Group 4	1,912	1,684	88.1	18	0.9	26	1.4	0	0.0	131	6.9	53	2.8	228	11.9	18.8
Census Tract 19, Block Group 1	1,021	1,001	98.0	20	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	2.0	23.5
Direct Impacts Study Area Total	6,782	5,514	81.3	38	0.6	182	2.7	11	0.2	391	5.8	646	9.5	1,268	18.7	26.3
Census Tract 5.01, Block Group 1	846	640	75.7	13	1.5	14	1.7	0	0.0	23	2.7	156	18.4	206	24.3	24.7
Census Tract 5.01, Block Group 2	1,047	799	76.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	248	23.7	0	0.0	248	23.7	21.2
Census Tract 5.01, Block Group 3	952	873	91.7	0	0.0	12	1.3	0	0.0	27	2.8	40	4.2	79	8.3	18.8
Census Tract 5.02, Block Group 1	1,587	1,061	66.9	17	1.1	29	1.8	49	3.1	106	6.7	325	20.5	526	33.1	39.6
Census Tract 5.02, Block Group 2	1,841	1,324	71.9	28	1.5	20	1.1	6	0.3	63	3.4	400	21.7	517	28.1	57.6
Census Tract 5.02, Block Group 3	1,454	1,070	73.6	11	0.8	9	0.6	11	0.8	55	3.8	298	20.5	384	26.4	44.8
Census Tract 8, Block Group 6	1,203	1,140	94.8	0	0.0	52	4.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	0.9	63	5.2	7.7
Census Tract 9, Block Group 2	2,980	2,328	78.1	18	0.6	158	5.3	0	0.0	154	5.2	322	10.8	652	21.9	5.5
Census Tract 9, Block Group 4	1,891	1,678	88.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	213	11.3	213	11.3	8.7
Census Tract 10, Block Group 1	899	583	64.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	0.8	0	0.0	309	34.4	316	35.2	41.6
Census Tract 10, Block Group 2	288	282	97.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	2.1	28.5
Census Tract 11, Block Group 1	717	648	90.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	55	7.7	14	2.0	69	9.6	24.1
Census Tract 11, Block Group 2	506	379	74.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	127	25.1	127	25.1	46.6
Census Tract 11, Block Group 3	704	489	69.5	164	23.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	51	7.2	215	30.5	39.2
Census Tract 11, Block Group 4	579	501	86.5	0	0.0	34	5.9	17	2.9	0	0.0	27	4.7	78	13.5	27.8
Census Tract 11, Block Group 5	1,361	873	64.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	1.4	65	4.8	404	29.7	488	35.9	37.5
Census Tract 11, Block Group 6	716	625	87.3	0	0.0	35	4.9	0	0.0	42	5.9	14	2.0	91	12.7	24.7

Area	2013 Total Population	Race and Ethnicity ^a												Minority	Total Minority %	Percent of Individuals Below Poverty Level
		White	%	Black	%	Asian and Pacific Islander	%	American Indian and Alaska Native	%	Other	%	Hispanic	%			
Census Tract 11, Block Group 7	714	594	83.2	0	0.0	7	1.0	0	0.0	19	2.7	94	13.2	120	16.8	33.8
Census Tract 12, Block Group 3	1,338	1,191	89.0	22	1.6	6	0.4	50	3.7	39	2.9	30	2.2	147	11.0	17.8
Census Tract 13, Block Group 1	977	942	96.4	0	0.0	26	2.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	0.9	35	3.6	21.5
Census Tract 13, Block Group 2	899	637	70.9	18	2.0	60	6.7	32	3.6	69	7.7	83	9.2	262	29.1	26.7
Census Tract 13, Block Group 3	752	602	80.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	2.0	15	2.0	120	16.0	150	19.9	11.7
Census Tract 13, Block Group 4	983	722	73.4	0	0.0	7	0.7	7	0.7	84	8.5	163	16.6	261	26.6	47.8
Census Tract 15.02, Block Group 2	934	805	86.2	0	0.0	35	3.7	0	0.0	18	1.9	76	8.1	129	13.8	6.2
Census Tract 15.02, Block Group 3	599	457	76.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	2.7	126	21.0	142	23.7	57.8
Census Tract 15.02, Block Group 4	1,602	1,077	67.2	10	0.6	41	2.6	0	0.0	52	3.2	422	26.3	525	32.8	14.0
Census Tract 15.02, Block Group 5	504	369	73.2	13	2.6	22	4.4	0	0.0	67	13.3	33	6.5	135	26.8	38.5
Census Tract 16, Block Group 2	881	834	94.7	0	0.0	22	2.5	0	0.0	14	1.6	11	1.2	47	5.3	7.7
Census Tract 16, Block Group 3	1,510	1,483	98.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	0.7	16	1.1	27	1.8	4.2
Census Tract 16, Block Group 4	1,470	1,207	82.1	0	0.0	49	3.3	0	0.0	120	8.2	94	6.4	263	17.9	11.4
Census Tract 16, Block Group 5	2,233	2,066	92.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	0.9	0	0.0	148	6.6	167	7.5	11.2
Census Tract 17, Block Group 1	535	535	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	10.8
Census Tract 17, Block Group 5	1,900	1,654	87.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	40	2.1	59	3.1	147	7.7	246	12.9	4.8
Census Tract 20.01, Block Group 1	847	697	82.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	67	7.9	63	7.4	20	2.4	150	17.7	26.6
Census Tract 20.01, Block Group 2	1,172	1,106	94.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	25	2.1	41	3.5	66	5.6	1.2
Census Tract 20.01, Block Group 3	1,083	1,034	95.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	0.6	42	3.9	0	0.0	49	4.5	3.4
Census Tract 20.02, Block Group 1	1,378	1,217	88.3	0	0.0	31	2.2	0	0.0	69	5.0	61	4.4	161	11.7	12.1
Census Tract 20.02, Block Group 2	1,294	1,086	83.9	14	1.1	0	0.0	64	4.9	110	8.5	20	1.5	208	16.1	12.1
Census Tract 20.02, Block Group 3	1,031	1,031	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3.4
Census Tract 21, Block Group 3	1,164	955	82.0	39	3.4	9	0.8	13	1.1	113	9.7	35	3.0	209	18.0	17.7
Indirect Impacts Study Area	45,371	37,594	82.9	367	0.8	678	1.5	429	0.9	1,843	4.1	4,460	9.8	7,777	17.1	20.4

Area	2013 Total Population	Race and Ethnicity ^a												Minority	Total Minority %	Percent of Individuals Below Poverty Level
		White	%	Black	%	Asian and Pacific Islander	%	American Indian and Alaska Native	%	Other	%	Hispanic	%			
Longview, WA	36,656	29,897	81.6	161	0.4	852	2.3	346	0.9	1,920	5.2	3,480	9.5	6,759	18.4	22.6
Cowlitz County	102,110	87,214	85.4	489	0.5	1,554	1.5	1,028	1.0	3,717	3.6	8,108	7.9	14,896	14.6	17.6

Notes: Shading indicates a minority and/or low-income community.

^a The racial and ethnic categories are defined further as: White (White alone, not Hispanic or Latino); Black (Black or African American alone, not Hispanic or Latino); Asian and Pacific Islander (Asian alone, not Hispanic or Latino or Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, not Hispanic or Latino); American Indian and Alaska Native (American Indian and Alaska Native alone, not Hispanic or Latino); Other (Some other race alone, not Hispanic or Latino; Two or more races, not Hispanic or Latino); Hispanic (Hispanic or Latino; Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race).

^b Census Tract 3 Block Group 1 and Census Tract 6.01 Block Group 3 are presented in the study area for the project sites, but are both also in the study area for the rail line.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2009-2013 Five-Year Estimates.