

A. INTRODUCTION

As described throughout this Tier I EIS, the Cross Harbor Freight Program (CHFP) has the potential to result in regional transportation and air quality benefits while creating local traffic, air quality, land use, and noise impacts in communities near the tunnel portals, waterfront termini, and supporting facilities. Since Tier I of the EIS does not include engineering and design beyond a high level definition of viable alternatives, the physical and operational project alternatives presented in Chapter 4, “Alternatives,” are conceptual and aimed at facilitating program-level analyses. This requires a broader approach in which effects are often referred to by type, probable magnitude, and general location. It is anticipated that detailed evaluations conducted as part of any subsequent Tier II environmental review would provide specific information about impacts generally assessed here.

The following sections describe the regulatory requirements and methodology for evaluating potential environmental justice effects, identify where environmental justice populations are present along the project alignment, describe potential adverse effects, and identify whether any effects would be disproportionately borne by environmental justice populations. The last section of this chapter identifies detailed environmental justice analyses that would be undertaken in any subsequent Tier II documentation.

B. REGULATORY CONTEXT

Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations* (February 11, 1994), directs federal agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects that their programs, policies, and activities may have on minority and low-income populations. Following the direction of Executive Order 12898, federal agencies developed their own guidelines to implement environmental justice.

This analysis was developed in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) *Environmental Justice – Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act*, USDOT Updated Environmental Justice Order 5610.2(a) (Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations)¹, and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in *FHWA Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations* (Order 6640.23a dated June 14, 2012).²

USDOT Order 5610.2(a) defines the fundamental principles of environmental justice as follows:

¹ This Order updates USDOT’s original Environmental Justice Order, which was published April 15, 1997.

² The Federal Highway Administration issued Order 6640.23A in June 2012, which cancels its Order 6640.23 dated October 1998.

Cross Harbor Freight Program

- Avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority and low-income populations;
- Ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process; and
- Prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations.

USDOT Order 5610.2(a) requires the following:

- Consideration of mitigation and enhancement measures to benefit the affected minority and/or low-income population and all off-setting benefits to the affected populations, as well as design, comparative impacts, and the relevant number of similar existing system elements in non-minority and non-low-income areas;
- Evaluation of whether alternatives or mitigation measures are practical; and
- Documentation of the findings, determination, and/or demonstration made in accordance to the Order in the environmental document prepared for the program, policy, or activity.

C. METHODOLOGY

CEQ guidance defines a “minority person” as any individual who is a member of the American Indian, Alaska Native, Asian, Pacific Islander, Black, or Hispanic population groups. An area can be considered a minority community when the percentage of minorities in the study area is “meaningfully greater” than the minority percentage of the general population (usually the citywide or county-wide population) or when the percentage of minorities exceeds 50 percent.

The income criteria for a “low-income” household is defined as being at or below the U.S. Census Bureau’s annual statistical poverty threshold. A comparison is also made to the general population to determine whether a meaningfully greater number of low-income households exists in the study area.

The CEQ, USDOT, and FHWA documents identified above dictate a methodology for an environmental justice assessment that generally involves six basic steps:

1. Identify the areas where the project may cause adverse impacts either during construction or operation (i.e., the 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 project’s potential adverse impacts on minority and low-income populations;
4. Evaluate the project’s potential adverse effects on minority and low-income populations relative to its overall effects to determine whether any potential adverse impacts on those communities would be significant and disproportionately high;
5. Discuss mitigation measures for any identified disproportionate adverse impacts; and
6. Describe the public outreach and participation process for effectively engaging minority and low-income populations in the decision-making process.

Since, as described above, this Tier I EIS does not include engineering and design to the point where adverse impacts, and their disproportionality, can be precisely pinpointed, Steps 5 and 6 are replaced with:

- A comparison of the severity of adverse impacts in various communities along the proposed alignment; and
- An identification of potential Tier II analyses and potential mitigation measures.

A disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority and low-income populations is defined as an effect that is predominately borne by an environmental justice community, or an effect that is appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than that which would be suffered by a non-environmental justice community. In general, the determination of disproportionately affected populations is done by analyzing the pattern of overall environmental and human health impacts in relation to identified areas of low-income and minority populations.

STUDY AREAS

The study area for the environmental justice evaluation conducted as part of this Tier I EIS includes the counties where at least a portion of one of the project alternatives would be implemented (i.e., Kings, Queens, Bronx, Hudson, and Essex). Data have been collected and mapped to indicate where concentrations of persons of low-income and minority status can be found throughout the entire multi-county, bi-state region. This regional perspective provides context for determining how the potential for direct effects would relate to the presence of environmental justice communities.

In terms of potential local impacts, noise, air quality and traffic impacts have been assessed at key locations surrounding proposed waterfront termini and support facilities. The study areas for these analyses throughout this EIS are typically no greater than 1,000 feet from the centerline of the corridor, therefore, a similarly sized study area is assumed in identifying environmental justice populations that may be sensitive to potential direct effects along the rail line and surrounding proposed rail yards.

DATA

Sources for demographic data and related map generation information include the 2010 U.S. Census, New York City Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications (DoITT), New York City Department of City Planning (NYCDCP), and the respective county planning agencies in New Jersey and on Long Island.

Demographic data available from the U.S. Census have been utilized at the census tract level in determining the physical area of each respective community.

Data have been managed with a Geographic Information System (GIS) to organize information for assessment and evaluation and prepare the illustrational graphics included as part of this Tier I EIS. Any subsequent environmental review following this Tier I EIS would update demographic data, is appropriate.

D. EXISTING CONDITIONS

The New York City study area overall reveals an existing correlation between the presence of industrial land uses together with low income communities, since affordable housing often exists near industrial facilities. The South Bronx (e.g., Hunts Point, Oak Point) and some portions of the Brooklyn waterfront (e.g., Red Hook) dominated by industrial uses also contain residential populations, often both minority and low-income.

Because much of the general alignment of the CHFP runs through dense urban areas in New York City and Hudson County environmental justice populations can be found throughout the

entire alignment. Because the project's Rail Tunnel Alternatives would follow the alignment of an existing rail line that traverses such a large portion of New York City (i.e., the Bay Ridge Branch), the presence of environmental justice communities along the alignment is varied. Approximately 70 percent of the project alignment (including areas adjacent to waterfront termini and support facilities associated with the Build Alternatives) is located in or near environmental justice communities. Most of these are minority (not low-income) communities. In the New Jersey portion of the project alignment, the program rail lines run through minority communities; approximately half of these are also low income.

For most of the Waterborne Alternatives (with the exception of the Enhanced Railcar Float Alternative since its associated termini support facilities are more rail-based), several of the potential waterfront termini technically located in environmental justice census tracts (e.g., Hunts Point, Oak Point), would be located at the waterfront, away from any residential populations. In the few cases where areas adjacent to project facilities are not identified as environmental justice communities (e.g., Red Hook, Greenville Yard), no residential population is reported in the particular census tract where the facility is located.

Overall for those termini and support facilities that are located in or alongside environmental justice communities, approximately half of the census tracts are both minority and low-income, with the remainder divided between exclusively minority (not low-income) and exclusively low-income (not minority) communities.

E. POTENTIAL ADVERSE LOCAL IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The relationship between the potential regional benefits of the CHFP and potential adverse local impacts is especially evident in the environmental justice analysis. For example, while no project-related construction would take place on the northern shore of Staten Island, the project alternatives would divert some of the freight currently traveling in that area by truck. The area would potentially experience less truck traffic and fewer occurrences of air quality, noise, traffic congestion and safety issues that may be indirectly associated with existing truck traffic. The environmental justice communities in this area would benefit from the program's implementation and would experience no local effects as a result of construction. In most portions of the project alignment however, communities along potential termini and support facilities and along the project alignment may experience local impacts while the region overall would experience benefits resulting from a reduction of congestion on regional roadways.

The following list summarizes the impacts that would potentially affect environmental justice communities:

LAND USE

Direct effects to land use are anticipated under nearly all Waterborne and Rail Tunnel Alternatives, largely resulting from the acquisition of properties for the expansion of existing freight facilities. In most cases, these expansions would take place in largely industrial and transportation-related areas; however, in the Brooklyn study area, the proposed development of the East New York Yard would be located within 1,000 feet of residential communities that are also minority and low income communities. As noted previously, because of the nature of the study area and the presence of environmental justice communities throughout, any direct land use impacts would be borne almost exclusively by environmental justice communities, except in the area surrounding Fresh Pond.

TRAFFIC

As described in Chapter 5, “Transportation,” the volume of truck trips that would be generated at the local freight facilities would vary by alternative and terminal/service option; however, all of the Build Alternatives could result in increased truck traffic on local roadways near new and expanded termini and supporting facilities. At the same time, the analyses reveal region-wide benefits to both environmental justice and non-environmental justice communities due to a reduction in the volume of commodity trucks using regional roadways and Hudson River and harbor crossings. For example, such reductions are expected to take place on the north shore of Staten Island and the Cross-Bronx Expressway.

NOISE AND VIBRATION

The noise and vibration analysis presented in Chapter 6.7, “Noise and Vibration,” reveals that both the Waterborne and Rail Tunnel Alternatives would likely result in moderate to severe impacts throughout a large portion of the project alignment (see Table 6.7-8 and Figure 6.7-1), and therefore the potential for adverse noise and vibration impacts on environmental justice communities exists along the entire alignment. Detailed analysis of potential effects would be conducted during any subsequent Tier II analyses, at which point avoidance and mitigation measures would be devised to potentially reduce the number and severity of noise impacts on environmental justice communities.

AIR QUALITY

With regard to air quality, the program would provide regional air quality benefits by shifting freight movement from trucks to rail. It would also reduce congestion and resultant idling emissions on existing Hudson River crossings. As detailed in Chapter 6.6, “Air Quality,” none of the Build Alternatives are likely to result in adverse impacts on local air quality beyond 400 feet of waterfront termini and support facilities, and beyond 200 feet of rail lines (for the Rail Tunnel Alternatives). However, Chapter 6.6 discusses that potential impacts could occur within close proximity of waterfront termini and facilities (within 400 feet) and along rail lines (within 200 feet) since increased activities at waterfront termini and support facilities, would result in increased emissions from equipment and local truck traffic to and from those facilities. Therefore, air quality effects may be experienced by environmental justice communities adjacent to the project facilities as well as in surrounding areas. Information required to quantitatively analyze the effects of local increases in emissions is not available at this time; air quality effects on identified environmental justice communities would be examined in any subsequent Tier II analyses.

F. POTENTIAL ADVERSE LOCAL IMPACTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE POPULATIONS**WATERBORNE ALTERNATIVES***ENHANCED RAILCAR FLOAT ALTERNATIVE*

As described in Chapter 6.1, “Land Use, Neighborhood Character, and Social Conditions,” this alternative would require the acquisition of properties in the vicinity of 65th Street Yard, Oak Point Yard, Fresh Pond Yard, and Maspeth Yard. In addition, East New York would be used for storage and sidings within the existing right-of-way. Rail traffic to and from 65th Street and 51st Street Yards (the waterfront termini of this alternative) would utilize the Bay Ridge Branch. Environmental justice populations are present adjacent to all of these proposed locations.

As far as can be determined in the Tier I analysis, no residential areas, community facilities or open space would be affected by the acquisitions required for 65th Street Yard, Oak Point Yard, Fresh Pond Yard, and Maspeth Yard, and therefore the potential for adverse effects on environmental justice communities is unlikely. Subsequent Tier II analyses (outlined in Section G, “Potential Tier II Analysis”) would determine these conclusions. If adverse impacts are found, the Tier II analyses would determine whether these impacts are disproportionate to environmental justice communities and would identify appropriate measures to avoid or mitigate these impacts.

As described in Chapter 5, “Transportation,” this alternative could result in increased truck traffic on local roadways near its new and expanded termini and supporting facilities. Maspeth Yard, for example, may generate up to 265 trucks per day, carrying intermodal freight into and out of the facility (see Figure 5-7). Subsequent Tier II analyses would quantify the effects of this traffic on local intersections and therefore any project specific documentation would be able to determine whether adverse impacts are disproportionately borne by environmental justice communities.

The introduction of the aforementioned truck traffic (as well as rail traffic along the Bay Ridge Branch and other rail segments) has the potential to result in noise and air quality impacts, as described above in Section E, “Potential Adverse Local Impacts of the Project Alternatives.” Potential impacts may result in close proximity of waterfront termini and facilities and along rail lines, since increased activities at these locations would result in increased emissions from equipment and local truck traffic to and from those facilities. As all of the facilities associated with this alternative are located adjacent to environmental justice populations, the alternative may result in adverse impacts on these populations. The extent of these impacts, and whether they would be disproportionately borne by environmental justice populations, would be confirmed in Tier II analyses.

TRUCK FERRY ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would utilize Port Newark/Port Elizabeth as its western terminus. It is expected that a terminal facility required to support this alternative would comprise approximately 10 acres. The truck ferry terminal would be located in an established industrial area and would be buffered from any residential areas by Newark Liberty International Airport (EWR) to the west and Newark Bay to the east. Therefore, even though the alternative would generate approximately 400 to 560 trucks per day, it is unlikely that this alternative’s western terminus would result in adverse impacts on environmental justice community.

The eastern terminus of this alternative would comprise either one of the Brooklyn waterfront facilities (SBMT, 51st Street Yard, 65th Street Yard), one of the Bronx waterfront facilities (Oak Point or Hunts Point), or Maspeth. All of these facilities are located adjacent to environmental justice communities. While the expansion of these facilities is not expected to result in changes to land use (i.e., no changes to residential areas, community facilities or open space), the truck traffic generated by this alternative may result in adverse impacts on local intersections and resultant adverse impacts related to noise and vibration and air quality. The extent of these impacts, and whether they would be disproportionately borne by environmental justice populations, would be confirmed in Tier II analyses.

TRUCK FLOAT ALTERNATIVE

The potential effects of the Truck Float Alternative on environmental justice populations would be identical to those discussed under the Truck Ferry Alternative above.

LIFT ON-LIFT OFF (LOLO) CONTAINER BARGE ALTERNATIVE

Similar to the Truck Ferry and Truck Float Alternatives, this alternative would utilize Port Newark/Port Elizabeth as its western terminus. It is expected that a terminal facility required to support this alternative would be slightly larger than the Truck Ferry and Truck Float alternative at approximately 15 acres. Nonetheless, the truck ferry terminal would be located in an established industrial area and would be buffered from any residential areas by EWR to the west and Newark Bay to the east. Furthermore, this alternative would generate less than 150 trucks per day and therefore it is even less likely that this alternative's western terminus would result in adverse impacts on environmental justice community.

The eastern terminus of this alternative would comprise either one of the Brooklyn waterfront facilities (SBMT, 51st Street Yard, 65th Street Yard, Red Hook), or Maspeth.¹ Most of these facilities are located adjacent to environmental justice communities; as noted earlier, the Red Hook Container Terminal is located in a census tract with no residential population, however environmental justice communities are present immediately to the south. While the expansion of these facilities is not expected to result in changes to sensitive land uses (i.e., no changes to residential areas, community facilities or open space), the truck traffic generated by this alternative may result in adverse impacts on local intersections and resultant adverse impacts related to noise and vibration and air quality. However, due to the relatively low number of trucks generated by this alternative, adverse impacts may not be likely. The extent of these impacts, and whether they would be disproportionately borne by environmental justice populations, would be confirmed in Tier II analyses.

ROLL ON-ROLL OFF (RORO) CONTAINER BARGE ALTERNATIVE

The potential effects of the RORO Container Barge Alternative on environmental justice populations would be identical to those discussed under the LOLO Container Barge Alternative.

RAIL TUNNEL ALTERNATIVES***RAIL TUNNEL ALTERNATIVE***

This alternative would utilize Oak Island Yard for storage and classification and potentially for fillet/toupee operations; East New York for storage and sidings and potentially as a fillet/toupee yard; Fresh Pond Yard for classification and switching; 65th Street Yard, 51st Street Yard, and Oak Point Yard would be used to transfer carload freight, and Maspeth would be used to transfer intermodal freight. To accommodate this alternative, most of these facilities would be expanded through property acquisition. Direct effects to the industrial, manufacturing, and commercial land uses surrounding these facilities would be expected; however, at this point, no effects to sensitive land uses (residential land use, community facilities, and open space) are known. While all of these facilities are located adjacent to environmental justice communities, impacts are most likely at East New York. Under this alternative, expansion outside of the right-of-way would be required if the existing East New York facility is expanded into a fillet/toupee operation. As a result, there may be the potential for indirect land use effects to some sensitive uses within approximately one block of the expanded rail yard perimeter, where residences, commercial uses, and institutional uses (e.g., community facilities) would remain but with

¹ As discussed in Chapter 4, "Alternatives," a facility in New England may also serve as an eastern terminus for this alternative. As the location for this facility has not been determined at this time, its impacts on environmental justice communities cannot be determined.

intervening structures being removed and replaced with a rail yard. The aesthetics of such proximity may affect marketability and enjoyment of residential properties, and as described below, the potential noise or air quality effects associated with yard activity may affect residences, businesses, and community facilities alike. Further assessment would be required to determine potential effects on community cohesion, as roadways traversing the rail line without the proposed project, may no longer provide direct access to both sides of the tracks with this alternative in place. Further assessment of potential indirect effects to neighborhood character may also be appropriate, when details regarding traffic, air quality and noise impacts on community facilities and open space are known. The extent of these impacts, and whether they would be disproportionately borne by environmental justice populations, would be confirmed in Tier II analyses.

In addition to these potential impacts from the expansion of support facilities for this alternative, the alternative would generate an increase in train trips along the Bay Ridge Branch (nearly all of which is adjacent to environmental justice communities), on the Greenville Branch (which passes through environmental justice communities in Jersey City) and along other rail segments (most of which are also located adjacent to environmental justice communities, at least in part). At its maximum, the Rail Tunnel Alternative will generate up to 21 additional trains a day on the Bay Ridge Branch, up to 25 trains on the Greenville Branch, and between 500 and 750 trucks at its supporting facilities (see Figure 5-11). This increase in traffic would likely result in associated impacts from noise and vibration and in air quality. The extent of these impacts, and whether they would be disproportionately borne by environmental justice populations, would be confirmed in Tier II analyses.

RAIL TUNNEL WITH SHUTTLE (“OPEN TECHNOLOGY”) SERVICE ALTERNATIVE

In the east-of-Hudson region, this alternative would utilize Maspeth Yard for the transfer of intermodal freight and as an eastern terminus for the shuttle service.¹ Therefore, land acquisition, and all of its resultant effects, would be similar to the Rail Tunnel Alternative described above, except that Maspeth Yard would be expanded by an additional 10 acres, for a total of 70 acres.

In addition to these potential impacts from the expansion of support facilities for this alternative, the alternative would generate an increase in train trips along the Bay Ridge Branch, Greenville Branch, and other rail segments, which, as discussed above, pass through environmental justice communities. At its maximum, this alternative will generate up to 23 additional trains a day on the Bay Ridge Branch, up to 27 trains on the Greenville Branch, and between 650 and 750 trucks at its supporting facilities (see Figure 5-12). This increase in traffic would likely result in associated impacts from noise and vibration and in air quality. The extent of these impacts, and whether they would be disproportionately borne by environmental justice populations, would be confirmed in Tier II analyses.

RAIL TUNNEL WITH CHUNNEL SERVICE ALTERNATIVE

As described in Chapter 4, “Alternatives,” this alternative would utilize Oak Island Yard as the western terminus and East New York as the eastern terminus for the chunnel service. Both of these termini are located, at least in part, adjacent to environmental justice communities. Land

¹ As described in Chapter 4, “Alternatives,” the western terminus for the Rail Tunnel with Shuttle Service Alternative would be constructed outside of the Port District, at a location that is not determined at this time. Therefore an evaluation of the potential effects that may result from the construction of a terminus for this alternative would be undertaken in Tier II.

acquisition, and all of its resultant effects, would be similar to the Rail Tunnel Alternative described above.

In addition to these potential impacts from the expansion of support facilities for this alternative, the alternative would generate an increase in train trips along the Bay Ridge Branch, Greenville Branch, and other rail segments, which, as discussed above, pass through environmental justice communities. At its maximum, this alternative will generate up to 51 additional trains a day on the Bay Ridge Branch, up to 51 trains on the Greenville Branch, and approximately between 600 and 800 trucks at its supporting facilities (see Figure 5-13), including 810 trucks per day exiting the eastern terminus at East New York. This increase in traffic would likely result in associated impacts from noise and vibration and in air quality. The extent of these impacts, and whether they would be disproportionally borne by environmental justice populations, would be confirmed in Tier II analyses.

RAIL TUNNEL WITH AUTOMATED GUIDED VEHICLE (AGV) TECHNOLOGY ALTERNATIVE

The Rail Tunnel with AGV Technology Alternative would utilize Greenville Yard as the western terminus for the alternative (as a tunnel portal and as an AGV operating area) and new facility at East New York Yard as the eastern terminus. Land acquisition under this alternative (and all of its resultant effects) would be similar to the Rail Tunnel Alternative, except that Greenville Yard would be expanded by 30 acres and at East New York a new terminal would be constructed to accommodate the AGV service (approximately 15 acres).

At its maximum, this alternative will generate up to 21 additional trains a day on the Bay Ridge Branch, up to 25 trains on the Greenville Branch, and approximately 43 AGV platoons traveling between Greenville Yard and East New York. In addition, between approximately 250 and 750 trucks would be generated at its supporting facilities. This increase in traffic would likely result in associated impacts from noise and vibration and in air quality. The extent of these impacts, and whether they would be disproportionally borne by environmental justice populations, would be confirmed in Tier II analyses.

RAIL TUNNEL WITH TRUCK ACCESS ALTERNATIVE

As described in Chapter 4, “Alternatives,” the Rail Tunnel with Truck Access Alternative would utilize largely the same termini as the Rail Tunnel with AGV Service and therefore, land acquisition, and all of its resultant effects, would be similar to that alternative.

The Rail Tunnel with Truck Access Alternative will generate a similar number of trains as the Rail Tunnel Alternative (see Figure 5-14), since it is essentially the same tunnel, designed with pavement to allow rubber-tired vehicles to run through the tunnel during periods when trains are not present. Most important, the Rail Tunnel with Truck Access Alternative would result in over 5,000 trucks exiting the project alignment at East New York to access Linden Boulevard and other truck routes. This increase in traffic would likely result in severe associated impacts from noise and vibration and in air quality. The full extent of these impacts, and whether they would be disproportionally borne by environmental justice populations, would be confirmed in Tier II analyses.

G. POTENTIAL TIER II ANALYSIS

The results of the analyses conducted for this Tier I EIS generally reveal the likelihood and probable magnitude of potential effects. It is anticipated that the sensitivities to environmental

effects identified in this Tier I EIS would guide subsequent detailed environmental review, at which time engineering and survey information would be available at a level of detail that would allow for more definitive determination of impacts and their significance, including whether potential impacts would be borne disproportionately by environmental justice communities. Most importantly, it is anticipated that appropriate public involvement and community outreach would be undertaken as part of subsequent environmental reviews that may be required, and that the environmental justice assessment would rely on the most current Census data available at that time. Potential Tier II analyses and mitigation measures are described in further detail below.

Subsequent Tier II analyses, as identified in each chapter of this EIS, will be required to pinpoint and confirm many of the potentially adverse impacts identified in Tier I of this EIS. These targeted analyses will be required to determine whether the impacts borne by environmental justice communities may be disproportionately high. At that time, avoidance measures or mitigation would be developed to reduce impacts on environmental justice communities, as appropriate.

PUBLIC OUTREACH

A key component of environmental justice is engaging environmental justice populations as part of the transportation planning process. Building upon the project's robust public outreach program (described in Chapter 3, "Agency Coordination and Public Involvement"), subsequent Tier II public outreach efforts would include outreach specific to environmental justice communities to ensure broad community participation.

CEQ, USDOT, and FHWA guidance provide a number of strategies that may be appropriate to employ with this project:

- To better address Limited English Proficient (LEP) populations, major documents (or summaries thereof) would be translated into Spanish, and other languages appropriate for communities along the project alignment (e.g., Chinese, Hebrew, Yiddish, Haitian Creole, etc.). Translators would be available at meetings to ensure that LEP populations potentially affected by the proposed project have an understanding of potential impacts. Opportunities for LEP members of the public to comment on the proposed project may be provided throughout the NEPA process, including by means other than written communication, such as workshops or personal interviews.
- Public meeting notices, translated into appropriate languages, would be placed in local publications that have relevance to particular environmental justice communities.
- Public meetings would be held at various times and at various locations easily accessible by public transit. Targeted public meetings would be held in office of trusted community organizations or common gathering locations.
- The project website would continue to provide news and updates, easy access to project documents, and ways to contact the project team and/or provide comments on the project. *