

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Resource Report 5
FERC Docket No. CP19-__-000

Double E Pipeline, LLC
Double E Pipeline Project
Eddy and Lea Counties, New Mexico;
Loving, Ward, Reeves, and Pecos Counties, Texas

GAI Project Number: E171414.00, Task 006.011
July 2019



VOLUME II OF IV, PUBLIC INFORMATION

Prepared by: GAI Consultants, Inc.
2100 West Loop South, Suite 1400
Houston, Texas 77027-3525

Prepared for: Double E Pipeline, LLC
1790 Hughes Landing Boulevard, Suite 500
The Woodlands, Texas 77380-1693

EXHIBIT

L2

RESOURCE REPORT FIVE - SOCIOECONOMICS	
MINIMUM FILING REQUIREMENTS	
Information	Found in
1. For major aboveground facilities and major pipeline projects that require an environmental impact statement, describe existing socioeconomic conditions within the project area – Title 18 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part (§) 380.12 (g)(1)	Not Applicable
2. For major aboveground facilities, quantify impact on employment, housing, local government services, local tax revenues, transportation, and other relevant factors within the project area – 18 CFR § 380.12 (g)(2-6)	Not Applicable
INFORMATION OFTEN MISSING AND RESULTING IN DATA REQUESTS	
1. Evaluate the impact of any substantial immigration of people on governmental facilities and services and describe plans to reduce the impact on local infrastructure.	Section 5.2
2. Describe on-site workforce requirements, including the number of construction personnel who currently reside within the impact area, would commute daily to the site from outside the impact area, or would relocate temporarily and permanently within the impact area.	Section 5.1
3. Estimate total worker payroll and material purchases during construction and operation.	Section 5.1.6
4. Estimate project-related ad valorem and local tax revenues.	Section 5.1.6
5. Determine whether existing housing within the project area is sufficient to meet the needs of the additional population.	Section 5.1
6. Describe the number and types of residences and businesses that would be displaced by the project, procedures to be used to acquire these properties, and types and amounts of relocation assistance payments.	No residences or businesses would be displaced by the Project.
7. Describe impacts on local traffic due to construction- and operation-related traffic and worker commuting. Address impacts on marine traffic where applicable (e.g., LNG import/export facilities).	Section 5.3
8. Evaluate the effects of the project on minority and low-income populations in consideration of Executive Order 12898.	Section 5.4

**Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Resource Report 5
FERC Docket No. CP19-__-000**

**Double E Pipeline, LLC
Double E Pipeline Project
Eddy and Lea Counties, New Mexico;
Loving, Ward, Reeves, and Pecos Counties, Texas**

**GAI Project Number: E171414.00, Task 006.011
July 2019**



VOLUME II OF IV, PUBLIC INFORMATION

Prepared by: GAI Consultants, Inc.
2100 West Loop South, Suite 1400
Houston, Texas 77027-3525

Prepared for: Double E Pipeline, LLC
1790 Hughes Landing Boulevard, Suite 500
The Woodlands, Texas 77380-1693

Table of Contents

Resource Report 5: Socioeconomics	5-1
5.1 Population, Housing and Employment.....	5-1
5.1.2 Housing	5-2
5.1.3 Employment and Economy.....	5-3
5.1.4 Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation	5-6
5.1.5 Housing	5-6
5.1.6 Employment and Economy.....	5-7
5.2 Public Services	5-8
5.2.1 Existing Conditions.....	5-8
5.3 Traffic and Transportation	5-10
5.3.1 Existing Conditions.....	5-10
5.3.2 Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation	5-11
5.4 Environmental Justice	5-13
5.4.1 Existing Conditions.....	5-13
5.4.2 Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation	5-15
Table 5.1-1 Population by State and County	5-2
Table 5.1-2 Housing Characteristics in the Project Area	5-3
Table 5.1-3 Existing Socioeconomic Conditions in the Project Area.....	5-4
Table 5.1-4 Estimated Annual Property Taxes	5-8
Table 5.2-1 Public Services in the Project Area.....	5-8
Table 5.3-1 Well Trafficked Roads, Major Highways, and Railroads Crossed by the Project.....	5-11
Table 5.4-1 Demographics in the Counties Crossed by and Adjacent to the Project	5-17
Table 5.4-2 Demographics in the Affected Environment.....	5-17

RESOURCE REPORT FIVE - SOCIOECONOMICS	
MINIMUM FILING REQUIREMENTS	
Information	Found in
9. Conduct a fiscal impact analysis evaluating incremental local government expenditures in relation to incremental local government revenues that would result from construction of the project. Incremental expenditures include, but are not limited to, school operating costs, road maintenance and repair, public safety, and public utility costs.	Section 5.1.6

Resource Report No.	Data Request Number	Comment	Location Where Comment is Addressed		
			Resource Report	Section	Page
5	11	Page 5-13, paragraph 2: a. as per U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidance on use of the EJSCREEN, it is appropriate to cite source U.S. Census metadata for counties and states here, rather than EJSCREEN; b. the primary point of comparison (in the text) should be to county-wide minority population levels, with state and federal levels being a secondary point of comparison; and c. cite the median household incomes data source.	5	5.4.1.1 and 5.4.1.2	5-14 to 5-17
5	12	The text on page 5-4 refers the reader to tables 5.4-1 or 5.4-2 for comparing the percentage of low-income population in the affected environment to the adjacent counties. However, neither table provides this comparison. a. Clarify this discrepancy; and b. clarify the minority percentages in table 5.4-1, as they do not match those in table 5.4-2.	5	5.4.1, b. minority percentages in Table 5.4-1 are for counties crossed by the Project and minority percentages in Table 5.4-2 are limited to the direct Affected Environment (2-mile radius).	5-13 to 5-17
5	13	On page 5-14, paragraph 5, Summit identifies that linguistically isolated populations are present in the Project area. Discuss whether Summit plans to take any measures to identify and reach out to linguistically isolated populations?	5	5.4.2	5-16

Data Request Response Matrix

Resource Report No.	Data Request Number	Comment	Location Where Comment is Addressed		
			Resource Report	Section	Page
5	1	Identify applicable county tax rate and annual receipts on infrastructure/real property that would apply to this project.	5	5.1.6 and Table 5.1-4	5-7 to 5-8
5	2	Provide an estimated breakdown of the number of permanent personnel by facility (or region if not assigned to a particular facility).	5	5.1.4.1	5-6
5	3	Provide an estimate of the portion of the workforce that would likely originate from outside the project area.	5	5.1.4.1	5-6
5	4	Address where short-term housing is primarily available for both the project's northern region (i.e., Carlsbad area) and at the southern project termini (i.e., Pecos and Reeves Counties).	5	5.1.5	5-6
5	5	For page 5-7, paragraph 6: a. provide an estimate of the local spend multiplier; b. clarify what the term "local spend" references; and c. provide a breakdown by county of the estimated annual property taxes.	5	5.1.6 and Table 5.1-4	5-8
5	6	On page 5-9: a. The first paragraph mentions that Midland and Ector Counties school districts are in the project area. Clarify why these are included in the discussion, as the project is not located in these counties; b. the first two paragraphs discuss how oil and gas employment growth is straining local school, police, and infrastructure resources; however, the discussion concludes that during construction and operation, public service requirements of the project are expected to be negligible. Clarify the discrepancy or supplement with text in support for this conclusion; and c. given the high fatality rate in the project area due to increased construction traffic, Summit should develop and implement a safety/traffic management plan to address the rapidly increasing traffic fatality rates.	5	a. 5.2.1 b. 5.2.1.1 c. 5.3.2	a. 5-9 b. 5-9 c. 5-10 to 5-13
5	7	Given the distance between developed areas where housing is located and the locations of pipeline facilities, and considering the high accident rate on U.S. Route 285, explain if Summit would require its construction contractor to provide buses to bring workers to the construction site(s).	5	5.3.2; The decision to bus workers will be made upon contractor selection.	5-11
5	8	Identify where Summit intends to allow construction personnel to park their vehicles, and reference these locations (e.g., additional workspaces, facility work areas, staging areas, etc.).	5	5.3.2	5-11
5	9	For the text on page 5-12 and table 5.4-1, Summit's EJSCREEN data appears to have been screened for only a polygon 2 miles wide, centered on the pipeline. Confirm that the EJSCREEN values were determined in this regard, and not drawn from the entire counties affected.	5	5.4.1	5-13 to 5-14
5	10	Regarding table 5.4-1, clarify if Otero, Culberson, and Jeff Davis Counties are within 1 mile of the project.	5	5.4.1 and Table 5.4-1	5-13 to 5-17

Resource Report 5: Socioeconomics

Double E Pipeline, LLC ("Company") is applying to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("Commission") for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity under Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act ("NGA") for authorization to construct and operate the proposed Double E Pipeline Project ("Project") in Eddy and Lea Counties, New Mexico ("NM"); and Loving, Ward, Reeves, and Pecos Counties, Texas ("TX").

The Project involves the proposed construction and operation of approximately 132.9 combined miles of varying diameter trunk-line and lateral steel natural gas pipeline connecting the Delaware Basin production areas in NM and TX to Waha. The Project's approximately 116.6 miles of trunk-line, which is comprised of approximately 33.3 miles of Trunk-line 100 ("T100"), approximately 81.9 miles of Trunk-line 200 ("T200"), and approximately 1.4 miles of Trunk-line 300 ("T300"), is proposed to begin in Eddy County, NM and travel in a generally southeastward direction to the Waha Receiver and Separation Site in Reeves County, TX to its ultimate terminus in Pecos County, TX. A 16.3-mile lateral (Lateral 100 ["L100"]) is also proposed as part of the Project and would be located in Eddy County, NM. An overview of the Project is shown on Figure 1.1-1. Cumulative Impacts are discussed in Resource Report 1, Section 1.9.

Resource Report 5 describes the socioeconomic conditions in the Project area and provides an analysis of the potential socioeconomic impacts resulting from construction and operation of the Project. However, the Project does not include major aboveground facilities and major pipeline projects that require an environmental impact statement.

5.1 Population, Housing and Employment

5.1.1 Existing Conditions

5.1.1.1 Population

Population data were obtained from the most recent U.S. Census Bureau online databases (Census 2010 Total Population and 2017 Population Estimate [as of July 1, 2017]). Population data are provided in Table 5.1-1. The 2017 estimated population ranged from 134 people in Loving County, TX, to 68,759 people in Lea County, NM. Population density ranged from 0.1 persons per square mile in Loving County, TX, to 14.7 persons per square mile in Lea County, NM. The population increased in all counties crossed by the Project between 2010 and 2017. Loving County, TX, experienced a large increase in population (63.4 percent); however, since the overall 2017 estimated population is 134 people within a county that has an area of 669 square miles, the addition of 52 people is not considered substantial.

Transient residents, such as those that live in temporary housing (RV camps, travel trailers, hotels, worker lodges, etc.) are not included in the overall population estimate by the U.S. Census Bureau. Due to the growth of the oil and gas industry in the counties crossed by the Project, it can be assumed that the number of people working and living in the counties crossed by the Project is far larger than is estimated in Table 5.1-1 below due to the influx of temporary workers.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BLM	Bureau of Land Management
Commission	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Company	Double E Pipeline, LLC
EJSCREEN	Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping Tool
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
L100	Lateral 100
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NGA	Natural Gas Act
NM	New Mexico
Project	Double E Pipeline Project
ROW	Right-of-way
T100	Trunk-line 100
T200	Trunk-line 200
T300	Trunk-line 300
TX	Texas
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency

drive from the Project area. According to a Housing Needs Assessment in 2015 by the City of Hobbs (Lea County), there are over 1,900 hotel rooms in Hobbs and 65 percent of these rooms were occupied (RRC Associates LLC, 2015).

Table 5.1-2
Housing Characteristics in the Project Area

State/ County	Housing Units 2017 ¹			Number of Sites for Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use (RV Parks, Campgrounds, etc.) ²	Number of Hotels and Motels ³
	Housing Units	Vacant Housing Units	Rental Vacancy Rate (percent)		
Lea County, NM	25,937	3,908	12.8	217	37
Eddy County, NM	24,011	2,738	4.2	234	51
Loving County, TX	59	28	0	1	2
Ward County, TX	4,755	801	5.3	39	9
Reeves County, TX	4,629	898	4.5	170	25
Pecos County, TX	5,645	1,225	3.5	106	17

Notes:

- ¹ U.S. Census Bureau. 2017. 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Accessed January 2019. <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>.
- ² U.S. Census Bureau. 2010. 2010 Census. Accessed January 2019. <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>.
- ³ Within a one-hour drive of the Project area. Google Earth and Google Maps. Accessed January 2019.

According to the Carlsbad Department of Development in Eddy County, NM, as of September 2017, the rate of occupancy for all apartments in the Carlsbad area was at 90 to 100 percent and many apartment complexes had a waiting list. The housing shortage is due to an influx of workers in oil and gas coupled with a diverse and thriving economy. The Carlsbad Department of Development estimates that there will be an approximate 1,800-2,300 deficit in the number of housing units by 2020 and are therefore working to attract an additional 1,000 housing units per year (2017). West TX (Monahans, Kermit and Pecos) is also experiencing a housing shortage; however, Monahans Economic Development is developing additional apartment buildings with more than 100 units and homes, anticipated to come online in the next year or two (CBS, 2018). Pecos Economic Development Corporation is also developing new homes and apartment complexes (Jasper, 2018). Many private developers are also expanding, such as Permian Lodging, which is currently in construction for two dormitory-style lodges in West TX with a total of almost 1,300 beds; Target Lodging, which announced a 400-bed housing lodge in Carlsbad is expected to be open by the end of 2019 (approximately nine miles north of L100). In addition, a recently constructed 458-bed workforce housing facility is located outside of Orla, TX, (approximately nine miles west of the trunk-line in Reeves County) (Adams-Heard, 2018a; Hedden, 2019; Aries Residence Suites, 2019).

5.1.3 Employment and Economy

Table 5.1-3 provides economy and employment data for the counties crossed by the Project from the U.S. Census Bureau online databases (2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates) and the U.S. Department of Labor's December 2018 preliminary data. In

Table 5.1-1
Population by State and County

State/County	2017 Estimated Population ¹	2010 Population Density (persons per square mile) ²	Population Change 2010 – 2017 (Percent)
Lea County, NM	68,759	14.7	6.2
Eddy County, NM	56,997	12.9	5.9
Loving County, TX	134	0.1	63.4
Ward County, TX	11,472	12.8	7.6
Reeves County, TX	15,281	5.2	10.9
Pecos County, TX	15,634	3.3	0.8

Notes:

- 1 U.S. Census Bureau. 2017. 2017 Population Estimate (as of July 1, 2017). Accessed January 2019. <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>.
- 2 U.S. Census Bureau. 2010. 2010 Census. Accessed January 2019. <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>. Population density is not available in the 2017 Population Estimate or the 2013-2017 American Community Survey.

The 2017 estimated combined population of all six counties is 168,277 people, 75 percent of which reside in the NM counties crossed by the Project. Approximately 70 percent of the population in Lea County resides in Hobbs and Lovington, more than 40 miles to the northeast of the Project area. Eddy County exhibits a similar trend: approximately 70 percent of the population resides in Carlsbad and Artesia, more than 10 miles to the northwest of the Project area. The Project is located in rural settings with very low population densities.

5.1.2 Housing

Table 5.1-2 provides housing data for the counties crossed by the Project from the U.S. Census Bureau online databases (2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates and the 2010 Census, General Population and Housing Characteristics) and a search via Google Earth. The number of housing units varies across the counties depending on the presence of an urban area and the county population. Based on the 2010 Census, in Lea County (the most populated county), approximately 68 percent of the housing units were located in Hobbs, approximately 42 miles west, and Lovington, approximately 40 miles north, of the Project area. In Eddy County, the Project's northern region, approximately 71 percent of the housing units were located in Carlsbad, approximately 18 miles west, and Artesia, approximately 35 miles northwest, of the Project area. In Ward County, approximately 63 percent of the housing units were located in Monahans, about 20 miles from the Project area. In Reeves County, approximately 76 percent of the housing units were located in Pecos, approximately 15 miles to the west of the Project area. In Pecos County, the Project's southern region and terminus, approximately 56 percent of the housing units were located in Fort Stockton located approximately 30 miles south of the Project area. Due to the low population of Loving County, there are no cities or densely populated areas and housing units were located in one census county division, which encompasses the Project area.

The six counties combined have almost 9,600 vacant housing units available as of 2017, although actual rental vacancy rates range widely, from zero percent in Loving County, TX to 12.8 percent in Lea County, NM. There are approximately 141 motels/hotels within a one-hour

Table 5.1-3 (Continued)

State/ County	Per Capita Income ¹	Median Household Income ¹	Civilian Labor Force ²	Unemployment Rate ²	Top Two Major Industries ¹
Loving County, TX	\$35,530	\$80,938	99	4.0	1) Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing and Hunting/Mining 2) Wholesale Trade
Ward County, TX	\$26,860	\$63,333	5,941	2.8	1) Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing and Hunting/Mining 2) Educational Services/Health Care/Social Assistance
Reeves County, TX	\$18,992	\$49,390	8,197	2.0	1) Educational Services/Health Care/Social Assistance 2) Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing and Hunting/Mining
Pecos County, TX	\$19,088	\$50,543	6,336	3.5	1) Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing and Hunting/Mining 2) Educational Services/Health Care/Social Assistance

Notes:

¹ U.S. Census Bureau. 2017. 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Accessed January 2019. <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>.

² U.S. Department of Labor. December 2018 (Preliminary). BLS Data Viewer. Accessed March 2019. <https://beta.bls.gov/dataViewer/view>.

NM saw an 80 percent increase, or \$716 million dollars, in overall matched taxable gross receipts from mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction during fiscal year 2018 as compared to 2017. The oil industry is the primary driver in matched taxable gross receipt growth (which are utilized to reconcile tax returns against payments to account for total revenues generated by business activities). Matched taxable gross receipts in Eddy and Lea Counties, NM, grew about 60 percent year-over-year (New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee, 2018a). NM typically receives about \$2 billion in direct revenue from oil and gas production through severance, property taxes, royalty and rental income. Another \$300 million comes from sales and income taxes on oil and gas drilling and service. Most oil and gas revenue is deposited into the general fund, and in most years, oil and gas revenue makes up about 15 to 25 percent of the total general fund revenue. Public education typically receives the largest share of the general fund (about 45 percent), health and human services is second (25 percent), and the remaining 15 percent goes to state government (NM Legislative Finance Committee, 2018b). Revenue from oil and gas production also supports NM's land grant permanent fund, which provides income generated to beneficiaries such as public schools and hospitals, and the severance tax permanent fund, which is used to retire debt for government projects (NM Legislative Finance Committee, 2018c). In NM, transportation is funded primarily by the state road fund and federal revenue.

2018 tax revenue from oil and gas in TX was up 50 percent from 2017 (TX Comptroller of Public Accounts, 2018). TX expects to collect \$6.7 billion from oil and gas industry taxes for the 2018-2019 budget cycle (TX Standard, 2018). Revenue from the taxes is divided among the Economic Stabilization Fund (37.5 percent), which is used for emergency and one-time

2017, the NM state unemployment rate was 7.7 percent and per capita income was \$25,257 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). In 2017, per capita income in Lea County, NM, was slightly below the state average, while per capita income in Eddy County, NM, was above the state average. In December 2018, the seasonally adjusted state unemployment rate decreased to 5.0 percent (U.S. Department of Labor, 2018). In 2018, unemployment rates in Eddy and Lea Counties, NM, were below the state average.

In 2017, the TX state unemployment rate was 5.8 percent and the per capita income was \$28,985. Per capita income in Loving County was above the state average; however, per capita income in Ward, Reeves and Pecos was below the state average (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). In December 2018, the seasonally adjusted state unemployment rate decreased to 3.7 percent (U.S. Department of Labor, 2018). The unemployment rate in Loving County was slightly above the state average; however, unemployment rates in Ward, Reeves and Pecos Counties were below the state average. Unemployment rates ranged from 2.0 in Reeves County, TX, to 4.0 percent in Loving County, TX.

Unemployment rates in the counties crossed by the Project dropped drastically from 2017 to 2018. For example, Reeves County went from an 8.0 percent unemployment rate in 2017 to a 2.0 percent unemployment rate in 2018, and Lea County went from an unemployment rate of 6.2 percent in 2017 to 3.8 percent in 2018. The low unemployment rate has put local businesses and governments in the area under pressure with staff leaving for oilfield jobs (Hart Energy, 2019). Similarly, the influx of labor into the local economy has resulted in upward pressures on consumer good pricing and decreases in availability (Matthews and Elliott, 2019).

In 2017, per capita income ranged from \$18,992 in Reeves County, TX, to \$35,530 in Loving County, TX. In NM in 2017, the median household income was \$46,718. Median household income in Eddy and Lea Counties was above the state median. In TX in 2017, the median household income was \$57,051. Median household income in Loving and Ward Counties was above the state median. Median household income ranged from \$49,390 in Reeves County, TX, to \$80,938 in Loving County, TX. The two major industries in the counties crossed by the Project were 1) agriculture/forestry/fishing and hunting/mining and 2) educational services/health care/ social assistance. Other top industries include wholesale trade, construction, and utilities/transportation/warehousing. The total civilian labor force in the counties crossed by the Project was 84,201 workers in December 2018, an increase of approximately 1,000 workers from 2017.

Table 5.1-3
Existing Socioeconomic Conditions in the Project Area

State/ County	Per Capita Income ¹	Median Household Income ¹	Civilian Labor Force ²	Unemployment Rate ²	Top Two Major Industries ¹
Lea County, NM	\$24,507	\$59,285	30,939	3.8	1) Agriculture/Forestry/ Fishing and Hunting/Mining 2) Educational Services/Health Care/Social Assistance
Eddy County, NM	\$28,419	\$60,703	32,689	3.2	1) Educational Services/Health Care/Social Assistance 2) Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing and Hunting/Mining

Construction may temporarily increase the local population; however, rental vacancy rates range widely in the counties crossed by the Project (see Section 5.1.2.1). Some areas may experience a strain on housing due to other construction projects in the area and seasonal tourists. However, non-local workers may reside all along the proposed 116.6-mile trunk-line and 16.3-mile lateral due to the overall linear nature of the Project. The total number of available housing units within the six counties crossed by the Project (9,600), number of temporary housing locations (908 [RV parks, campgrounds, motels and hotels]), and number of housing units coming online in the next year are anticipated to be sufficient for the Project. Short-term housing is available primarily in Carlsbad, Eddy County, NM for the Project's northern region and in Pecos and Fort Stockton, Reeves and Pecos Counties, TX for the Project's southern terminus.

5.1.6 Employment and Economy

The Project is expected to provide mostly positive, but limited and short-term impacts to the local economy, specifically related but not limited to the leisure and hospitality sector, which would cater to the influx of temporary workers. These impacts are expected to be temporary in nature and predominantly limited to the timeframe when construction is ongoing, and most workers are not likely to be accompanied by their families.

However, as noted above, the influx of labor into the local economy has resulted in upward pressures on consumer goods pricing and decreases in availability (Matthews and Elliott, 2019). This Project's contribution to the localized pressures upon consumer goods supply and demand will be comparatively negligible and short-term.

Also, given the steady turnover of both large and small projects, it is unlikely the Project would register a notable economic impact relative to the magnitude of oil and gas related spending in the region. The Project is not expected to induce growth, displace businesses or permanent residences, or significantly contribute to long-term employment in the Project area. During the proposed Project construction, it is assumed that purchases would be made locally for vehicle fuel, a wide variety of construction materials, and other miscellaneous expenses. In addition, non-local workers will spend part of their income on local fuel, lodging, and food.

The Project crosses public lands, including those managed by: US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management ("BLM"); the NM State Land Office; and the TX University System. The BLM manages for multiple uses across regions and landscapes for several purposes including land conservation, cultural resource preservation, and fish and wildlife habitat conservation. The Project crosses BLM lands for approximately 46.0 miles. The Project crosses NM State Land Office lands for approximately 9.4 miles. Lease funds paid to the NM State Land Office benefit the state land trust, which includes schools, universities, hospitals and other important institutions. The Project crosses TX University System lands for a total of approximately 3.6 miles. Lease funds paid to the TX University System benefit the Permanent University Fund, which is one of the largest university endowments in the U.S. and benefits more than 20 education and health institutions across both the University of TX System and TX A&M University System.

All purchases are taxable at the general sales tax rate in each state and county. The general sales tax rate for NM is 5.125 percent and for TX is 6.25 percent. Calculation of property tax revenues associated with the Project facilities will be subject to state, county, and local taxes upon completion of construction. Company will compensate landowners in accordance with the terms of the right-of-way ("ROW") agreements.

Company estimates it will spend approximately \$486 million on labor, equipment, materials, acquisition, and other services to develop and construct the Project facilities, of which \$256 million is expected to be spent directly in TX and \$230 million to be spent directly in NM.

expenses; the State Highway Fund (37.5 percent), which is used for highway construction, maintenance and policing public roads; and Foundation School Program (25 percent), which funds teacher salaries, bilingual and special education. All funds also receive revenue from other sources (TX Tribune, 2018). In addition, the first \$2.5 billion in sales tax collections exceeding \$28 billion in any fiscal year is deposited to the State Highway Fund. Sales tax collections in fiscal year 2018 exceeded \$30.5 billion, so the full \$2.5 billion was allocated (TX Comptroller of Public Accounts, 2018).

5.1.4 Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation

5.1.4.1 Population

Company proposes operating up to two construction spreads for the pipelines. Construction of the receipt and delivery meters will be conducted by a separate workforce from the pipeline spreads. Peak workforce is estimated to be 600 workers, with an average workforce estimated to be approximately 500 workers. Six full-time equivalent personnel are proposed to be hired to operate and maintain the new Project facilities. Permanent personnel will be stationed at Summit Midstream's existing Lane Processing Plant, the Poker Lake Meter Station (including the Regional Office Building) or the Waha Receiver and Separation Site (or a combination thereof). Additionally, there will be approximately 10 full-time equivalent internal Company personnel that will originate outside the Project area, assisting in various roles. The outside Company personnel will not affect the regional population.

Construction of the Project may temporarily increase the population near the Project area. The increase in local population will result primarily from the influx of temporary employees during construction. Company has no means of definitively predicting where the contractor and sub-contractor labor pools would originate, but based on similar projects in the area, Company estimates that approximately 85 percent of the contractor labor pool will originate outside the Project area, and 15 percent will come from the local workforce. Local workforces support other natural gas facilities, and depending on the prospective contractor, a portion of the workforce may already reside permanently or temporarily near the Project given the amount of related exploration and production work continuously occurring throughout the region. The increase in population is anticipated to be short term in duration due to the one-year construction time period (September 2020 to August 2021). Several larger projects in the area will be finishing construction prior to the start of the proposed Project (for example, the XTO station and pipeline identified in Resource Report 1). With the steady turnover of regional projects being started and completed, it is not anticipated the Project would have a measurable impact on temporary population levels or significantly contribute to long-term employment in the Project area.

5.1.5 Housing

It is anticipated that non-local workers would utilize temporary accommodations such as hotels, motels, RV parks, temporary lodges, and homes/apartments available for rent for seasonal or temporary use. Much of the Project is located in rural areas; the majority of available temporary housing is located within the more populated areas of Hobbs, Lovington, Carlsbad, Artesia, Monahans, Pecos, and Fort Stockton. It is anticipated that impacts to housing will be short-term and dispersed, due to the construction time period and linear nature of the Project. As discussed above, the cycle of projects commencing and concluding in the area is continuous, and that trend is expected to remain unchanged throughout the Project's construction phase. Therefore, it is not anticipated the Project would have a measurable positive or negative impact on local housing levels.

Table 5.2-1 (Continued)

- ³ Loving County Sheriff's Office. 2019. Accessed January 2019. <https://www.lovingcountytexasheriff.org/sheriff>.
- ⁴ City of Monahans. 2019. Accessed January 2019. https://www.cityofmonahans.org/index.asp?SEC=90D002D7-3B98-4CBA-959A-6CF9750E6067&Type=B_BASIC.
- ⁵ Pecos, TX. 2019. Accessed January 2019. <https://www.pecostx.gov/government/departments/fire-department>.
- ⁶ Eddy County, NM. 2019. Accessed January 2019. <https://www.co.eddy.nm.us/161/Fire-Service>.
- ⁷ USA Fire & Rescue. 2018. Accessed January 2019. <https://www.usafireandrescue.com/>.
- ⁸ Reeves County Hospital. 2019. Accessed January 2019. <http://www.reevescountyhospital.com/>.
- ⁹ Carlsbad Medical Center. 2019. Accessed January 2019. <https://www.carlsbadmedicalcenter.com/>.
- ¹⁰ Nor-Lea Hospital District. 2019. Accessed January 2019. <https://www.nor-lea.org/about-us>.
- ¹¹ US Hospital Finder. 2019. Accessed January 2019. <http://www.ushospitalfinder.com/>.
- ¹² Lea Regional Medical Center. 2019. Accessed January 2019. <http://www.learegionalmedical.com/>.

A total of 81 public elementary, middle and high schools are in the counties crossed by the Project. Within the counties crossed by the Project, there are 18 police and sheriff departments, 22 fire and rescue departments, and 6 hospitals consisting of 418 beds. In general, the number of schools, police departments, fire and rescue departments, hospitals and beds are directly related to the population and population density of the county. In addition to hospitals, there are numerous outpatient clinics in the metropolitan areas of Carlsbad, Hobbs, Odessa, and Midland (Google Earth, 2019). The area is experiencing shortages in child care facilities, medical staff, police, corrections officers, school bus drivers, plumbers and electricians, among others (Blum, 2018; and Crowley, 2018a).

To accommodate growth in industry, for example, Hobbs, which lies two miles to the west of the TX border with NM, has added 30 police officers and 15 firefighters in recent years. Adding staff has become more difficult as housing prices have increased, and the city spends approximately \$6 million on incentive packages to entice new employees. However, revenues from taxes have outweighed new staff costs and the city has been able to make major capital upgrades, including repairs to sewer infrastructure, new fire station and new parks facilities (Duke University Energy Initiative, 2015).

5.2.1.1 Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation

Temporary immigration of non-local workers will be short term, limited to the one-year construction time period, and is not anticipated to affect the levels of service provided by medical, law and fire protection personnel. During construction and operation, public service requirements of the Project are expected to be negligible. Most workers are not likely to be accompanied by their families; therefore, few school-age children are anticipated to relocate and impact to public school enrollment or child care facilities is not anticipated. Police assistance may potentially be required to facilitate traffic flows during road crossings and Company will work with local police personnel to coordinate as necessary to minimize impacts. Road crossings are further discussed in Section 5.3, Traffic and Transportation.

Company shall establish an incident planning program as part of an Emergency Response Plan so that physicians, medical consultants, hospitals, and ambulance services in the area can efficiently work together to respond in case of an emergency. This coordinated effort will limit the impacts on public services in the Project area. Project supervisors will post emergency phone numbers in on-site construction trailers and maintain an up-to-date emergency response plan. The use of public services such as fire, police, or medical services, would be

These expenditures will generate economic activity and support employment and income elsewhere in the economy through the multiplier effect, as initial changes in demands “ripple” through the local economy and support indirect and induced impacts. The Company estimates that the local spend multiplier will be between 1.0 and 2.0.

During construction in the years 2020-2021, the Project would generate a local spend – which includes amounts paid for employees of local contractors and their associated employer taxes, benefits, temporary lodging, meals and other minor associated costs -- of \$35 million, of that, \$18 million will be spent in TX and \$17 million will be spent in NM. The NM gross receipt tax is estimated at \$5.5 million. TX sales tax is estimated at \$10.0 million. Annual property taxes are estimated to be approximately \$5.1 million, of that approximately \$3.5 million would be in TX and \$1.6 million would be in NM. Applicable county tax rates and annual receipts on infrastructure/real property are identified in Table 5.1-4 below.

Table 5.1-4
Estimated Annual Property Taxes

State	County	2018 Tax Rate	Annual Amount (millions)
NM	Eddy	0.7458%	\$1.59
TX	Loving	1.8110%	\$1.69
	Pecos	1.8735%	\$0.01
	Reeves	1.8685%	\$0.39
	Ward	1.8650% or 1.9279%	\$1.42
Totals			\$5.10

Tax revenue generated by the Project and other oil and gas-related projects is anticipated to support various infrastructure and education improvements in the region, as described in the revenue sources for funds in NM and TX in Section 5.1.3.

5.2 Public Services

5.2.1 Existing Conditions

Public services are available in the counties crossed by the Project, and include full-service law enforcement, fire departments, schools, and hospitals. An overview of public services available in each county is provided in Table 5.2-1.

Table 5.2-1
Public Services in the Project Area

State/County	Number of Public Schools ¹	Number of Police Departments 2,3,4,5	Number of Fire and Rescue Departments 3,4,5,6,7	Number of Hospitals/Beds 5,8,9,10,11,12
Lea County, NM	35	6	5	2/226
Eddy County, NM	25	5	13	1/115
Loving County, TX	0	1	1	0
Ward County, TX	7	2	1	1/25
Reeves County, TX	5	2	1	1/25
Pecos County, TX	9	2	1	1/27

Notes:

- Public Schools K12. 2011. Accessed January 2019. <http://publicschools12.com/all-schools/bx/>.
- USA Cops. 2018. Texas and New Mexico. Accessed January 2019. <https://www.usacops.com/>.

Table 5.3-1

Well Trafficked Roads, Major Highways, and Railroads Crossed by the Project¹

Approximate MP	County, State	Road Name	Road Type	Proposed Crossing Method
T100				
4.3	Eddy, NM	Hobbs Highway (NM Highway 180/US Highway 62)	State/Federal	Conventional Bore
14.9	Eddy, NM	Cimarron Road	Local	Conventional Bore
20.0	Eddy, NM	Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway	Railroad	Conventional Bore
20.0	Eddy, NM	Southwestern Railroad	Railroad	Conventional Bore
21.7	Eddy, NM	Jal Highway (NM Highway 128)	State	Conventional Bore
T200				
35.4	Eddy, NM	Buck Jackson Road	Local	Conventional Bore
41.9	Eddy, NM	Pipeline Road	Local	Conventional Bore
46.4	Eddy, NM	State Line Road	State	Conventional Bore
49.5	Loving, TX	Ranch Road 652	Local	Conventional Bore
52.1	Loving, TX	Private Road 3021	Local	Conventional Bore
61.5	Loving, TX	Private Road 3015	Local	Conventional Bore
68.5	Loving, TX	County Road 4017	County	Conventional Bore
72.1	Loving, TX	State Highway 302/Ranch Road 1211	State	Conventional Bore
89.8	Ward, TX	Ranch Road 2355	Local	Conventional Bore
97.0	Ward, TX	Union Pacific Railroad	Railroad	HDD
97.0	Ward, TX	Interstate 20 West	Federal	HDD
97.0	Ward, TX	Interstate 20 East	Federal	HDD
113.4	Reeves, TX	Farm Road 1450	State	Conventional Bore
T300 – Not Applicable – No Major Roads Crossed				
L100				
13.3	Eddy, NM	Onsurez Road (County Road 731)	County	Conventional Bore
13.3	Eddy, NM	Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway	Railroad	Conventional Bore
13.8	Eddy, NM	Pecos Highway (US Highway 285)	Federal	Conventional Bore

Note:

- ¹ US Census Bureau. 2015. *Tiger/Line Shapefile, 2015, Nation, U.S., Primary Roads National Shapefile*. <https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/tiger-line-shapefile-2015-nation-u-s-primary-roads-national-shapefile>.

5.3.2 Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation

The Project area will mainly be accessed by use of existing public and private roads. Temporary and permanent access roads will be required to access the ROW along the trunk-line and lateral. Further information on access roads required for the Project is included in Resource Report 8. Short-term impacts on roads and highways are anticipated during construction of the proposed Project. Federal and State roads will be crossed by conventional bore. Interstate 20 and Union Pacific Railroad will be crossed by horizontal directional drill.

temporary and limited to the construction phase of the Project; therefore, should an accident occur, Company does not anticipate the Project would result in an undue burden on public services. Company will adhere to its emergency management procedures, as further discussed in Resource Report 11, Reliability and Safety.

In addition, Company has proactively met with First Responders in the Project area and Company and their related entities regularly attend meetings with those critical service providers proximal to their ongoing operations in the area. At minimum, this coordination/communication will continue up to and throughout the construction phase of the Project and if issues and/or needs arise, they will be promptly addressed.

As discussed above, the cycle of projects commencing and concluding in the area is continuous, and that trend is expected to remain unchanged throughout the Project's construction phase. During construction and restoration, it is reasonable to expect that there will be temporal fluctuations in oil- and gas-related personnel in the Project region irrespective of the subject Project. However, within the context of this Region and the benchmark of ongoing oil and gas activity, it is not expected that the Project would have a measurable impact on public services.

5.3 Traffic and Transportation

5.3.1 Existing Conditions

The proposed Project is predominantly located within rural areas, but is proposed to cross several larger, well-traveled roads including: Hobbs Highway (NM Highway 180/US Highway 62), Jal Highway (NM Highway 128), State Highway 302/Ranch Road 1211, Interstate 20 East and West, and Pecos Highway (US Highway 285). Other less-traveled roads in the Project area are also paved and marked. Numerous access roads utilized for oil and gas production will also be crossed as will several railroads. Roads and railroads crossed by the Project are included in Table 1.3-1 in Resource Report 1, Appendix 1-B. The Project area is also served by Route 31 (Potash Mines Road), Route 720 (Black River Village Road), and Route 115. Pecos Highway (US Highway 285) runs north to south and parallel to the proposed trunk-line, approximately 15 miles to the west of the proposed Project. Major roads, highways and railroads crossed by the Project are included in Table 5.3-1 below. Traffic in the vicinity of the Project area has increased substantially since 2015 due to the expansion of oil and gas exploration, production, and transportation in the Delaware and Permian Basins. For example, Highway 302 in TX saw a 76 percent increase in traffic in 2017. Along with traffic, road accidents have increased. A road fatality occurs every 35 hours in the oilfield's counties, which is more frequent than the previous road fatality rate of one every 75 hours two years ago (Crowley, 2018b). Construction and operation impacts and mitigation are discussed in Section 5.3.2 below.

(76.7 acres), and the L100 Receipt and Operations Site (23.5 acres). This temporary construction workspace is identified in Table 1.2-1 and Table 1.2-2 in Resource Report 1. These sites will be used for contractor parking, fabrication, and laydown. Construction activities will proceed in sequence in an assembly-line fashion along the ROW from clearing until final restoration. As a result, workers will be divided between the pipeline spreads and the separate construction work on points of receipt and delivery, thereby reducing congestion in any one area. The meter contractors will fabricate the receipt and delivery meter locations at one of the laydown/contractor yard areas (Pecos Laydown Yard or proposed facility workspace utilized as such), which will minimize travel to the receipt and delivery meter locations. Due to the sequential nature of construction activities, traffic flow impacts that may arise will be temporary on a given section of roadway.

In addition, Company has established safety/traffic management policies, procedures and training for Company employees, that include but are not limited to: Smith Driving (defensive driving), Vehicle Safety training, Safety Meetings which include Safe Driving, Vehicle Tracking System, Job Planning, Safe Work Permitting. The policies are reviewed and updated annually and may be subject to change. Company permits certain employees to drive vehicles (any type of vehicle including a car, truck, golf cart, or ATV) owned, leased, or rented by the Company ("company cars") to perform work for the Company or on the Company's behalf during their period of employment. In addition, each driver is responsible for using company cars in a safe, lawful, and reasonable manner. Company has installed vehicle tracking systems in all fleet and pool vehicles. The equipment is used for, but not limited to, Commercial Motor Vehicle compliance, to locate employees at risk and to monitor employee compliance with company policies and state/local laws. Company also provides additional online training for employees to utilize.

One of Company's core safety principles is Vehicle Safety, which requires all drivers to use good judgment and proceed at a pace suitable to conditions of the vehicle itself, the job site, the road, the traffic, and the weather. Drivers must always obey local traffic laws and speed limits. Cell phones may only be used in the hands-free mode or with the vehicle pulled out of traffic and at a complete stop. The driver is responsible to ensure seatbelts are used by all occupants.

Company requires third-party contractors and vendors to be compliant in ISNetworld, which includes vehicle safety, training and accident records/stats. Companies who do not meet minimum requirements are not allowed to work for the Company. In addition, Company provides all contractors with a Contractor & Visitor Safety Orientation, which includes Company's Construction Cardinal Rules of Safety. One of the nine Cardinal Rules is Vehicle Safety, which mirrors the Company Vehicle Safety Policy described above. The Contractor & Visitor Safety Orientation notes the following additional items: using extreme caution when driving in unsafe conditions like extreme weather, high traffic areas, steep terrain; parking on job sites and in stations, finding safe locations (do not park on roadway, access roads, in front of tanks/separators), when driving the ROW; do not park behind equipment; and confirm all equipment operators see you and wave you around prior to passing.

Company will request the primary contractor to implement safety/traffic management plans, policies and procedures for their employees.

5.4 Environmental Justice

5.4.1 Existing Conditions

Executive Order 12898 requires Federal agencies to identify the environmental effects, including health, social and economic effects, of a project on minority and low-income communities or Native American programs, and to address, as appropriate, disproportionately

Boring and horizontal directional drilling typically requires additional temporary workspace areas on both sides of the crossing for excavating bore pits while the road remains in operation. Therefore, little or no disruption of traffic is expected at these crossings. All roads crossed by the proposed Project and the proposed crossing method are shown in Table 1.3-1 in Resource Report 1, Appendix 1-B.

Other local roads may be open-cut where permitted by local authorities or landowners. These areas of construction may require temporary closure of a road and establishment of detours. If no reasonable detour is feasible, at least one lane of a road would be kept open to traffic, except for brief periods when it is essential to close the road to install the pipeline. Company would avoid road closings during peak traffic hours. Open-cut crossings of roads would typically be completed in one to two days. Company will attempt to complete construction across high-traffic roads within 24 hours.

Roads affected by open-cutting will be returned to pre-construction conditions. If an open-cut road requires extensive construction time, provisions will be made for temporary detours or other measures to allow safe traffic flow during construction. Additionally, where required by the landowner, a temporary bridge or bypass could be established on small roads or driveways. Prior to closing roads, a road closure schedule would be arranged with the appropriate transportation authority, if applicable, and oil and gas facilities that could be affected by the closures. Law enforcement agencies also would be notified.

Where the ROW or access locations intersect public hard-surfaced roads, appropriate measures will be installed as a construction entrance to control mud and dirt tracking onto the highway. If excess soil or mud is tracked onto roadways, it would be removed as soon as practical.

To maintain safe conditions, Company would direct its construction contractors to comply with vehicle weight and width restrictions, and to remove excess soil that is left on the road surface by the crossing of construction equipment. In addition, when it is necessary for equipment to move across paved roads, mats or other appropriate measures would be used to prevent damage to the road surface. Contractors would employ the appropriate traffic control measures in accordance with all permits and local regulations at high-traffic roadway crossings and at any other crossings where deemed necessary either due to other conditions and/or by local authorities. At all road crossings, flaggers would direct traffic and appropriate construction notification signage would be displayed. Detours or obstructions in traffic flow due to large vehicles or construction of pipeline road crossings may require short-term assistance from local police in limited instances. As discussed in Section 5.2.1.1, Project-related demands on local police workloads are not expected to be significant.

The movement of construction equipment and materials from contractor and pipe storage yards to the construction work area would result in additional short-term impacts on the transportation network. Several construction-related trips would be made each day (to and from the job site) on each spread. Construction activities will be spaced over one construction spread. This level of traffic would remain constant throughout the construction period and would typically occur at off-peak early morning and evening hours. Local workers would commute to the Project from residences, and most non-local workers will likely commute from the various metropolitan areas, depending upon where temporary accommodations are secured. Company will recommend the pipeline contractor utilize multi-passenger vehicles to commute employees to and from the pipeline ROW. Workers may carpool to the Project site or be transported via school buses or vans. Parking will be available at additional temporary work spaces, facility work areas, and the laydown yard included on the Project. These include: the Pecos Laydown Yard in Reeves County (31.5 acres), Lane Plant Receipt Meter Station (6.4 acres), Poker Lake Meter Station (37.4 acres), Waha Receiver and Separation Site

The location of the Project is dictated by the contracted points of receipt and points of delivery and has not been sited in a manner that places an otherwise avoidable or inordinate impact upon minority populations while also achieving the purpose and need of the Project.

5.4.1.2 Low Income Populations

Company utilized EJSCREEN to obtain demographic indicators for low income populations in the Affected Environment, as presented in Table 5.4-2 (USEPA, 2018). Under the Threshold Criteria analysis, a low-income population is identified where the value for the Affected Environment is equal to or greater than that of the reference population. For this analysis, the reference population includes primarily the county percentages shown in Table 5.4-1, and secondarily the state and national averages discussed in the text.

The percentage of low income populations within the Affected Environment above the county percentages were found in Eddy County, NM, and Loving, Ward, Reeves and Pecos Counties, TX. Based on U.S. Census Bureau 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, the NM state percentage of low-income population is 20.6 percent, TX state percentage is 16.0 percent and the U.S. percentage is 14.6 percent (2017). The low-income population in the Affected Environment of Eddy County, NM, and Ward and Reeves Counties, TX was higher than the state and U.S. percentages.

Overall counties are discussed in Section 5.1.3, and in 2017, per capita income in Lea County, NM, was slightly below the state average by \$750, while per capita income in Eddy County, NM, was above the state average by \$3,167. In 2017, per capita income in Loving County was above the state average by \$6,545; however, per capita incomes in Ward (\$2,122 less), Reeves (\$9,993 less) and Pecos (\$9,097 less) were below the state average (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017).

In 2017, median household incomes in the overall counties of Eddy and Lea were above the state median by \$13,985 and \$12,567, respectively. In 2017, the median household incomes in the overall counties of Loving and Ward were above the state median by \$23,087 and \$6,282, respectively; while median incomes in the overall counties of Reeves and Pecos were slightly lower than the state median by \$7,661 and \$6,508, respectively average (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). In the overall counties crossed by the Project, unemployment rates ranged from 2.0 percent in Reeves County, TX, to 4.0 percent in Loving County, TX (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017).

As previously discussed in Section 5.4.1.2, the location of the Project is dictated by the contracted points of receipt and points of delivery. The Project has not been sited in a manner that places an otherwise avoidable or inordinate impact upon low-income populations while also achieving the purpose and need of the Project.

5.4.1.3 Linguistically Isolated Populations

Company utilized the EJSCREEN tool to identify linguistically isolated populations within the Affected Environment (USEPA, 2018). Linguistically isolated populations are rare but are present within the Affected Environments of Eddy County, NM, and Loving, Ward, Reeves and Pecos Counties, TX. Based on EJSCREEN, linguistically isolated households in the Affected Environment speak Spanish.

5.4.2 Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation

Most impacts will be temporary during construction of the Project. Permanent negative effects on these populations would be avoided because there will be no displacements of businesses or residences. Property will be restored to pre-existing conditions after construction, and landowners will be compensated for potential property damage or economic losses, if

high and adverse human health of environmental effects. Company utilized data from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("USEPA") Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping Tool ("EJSCREEN") to identify demographics in the Project area. For the purposes of this analysis, Company reviewed the affected environment in EJSCREEN to identify potential environmental justice concerns. The Affected Environment was generated by inputting the approximate Project location into EJSCREEN and generating a one-mile buffer on either side of the Project facilities within the boundary of each county (for a polygon two miles wide around the Project facilities). Census blocks were not utilized due to the sparse population in the Project area. For each demographic indicator, EJSCREEN averages the value over all residents within the one-mile buffer.

Company established the affected environment in accordance with guidance from the Council on Environmental Quality's *Environmental Justice Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act* ("NEPA") (1997), and the Federal Interagency Working Group's *Promising Practices for EJ Methodologies in NEPA Reviews* (2016). The analysis provided in the following sections utilizes the Affected Environment (two-mile-wide total radius on Project facilities within EJSCREEN) as described above. For comparison purposes, percentages of minority and low-income populations within the counties crossed by and counties adjacent to the Project are provided in Table 5.4-1. Otero, Winkler, Culberson and Jeff Davis Counties are adjacent to counties crossed by the Project, are shown for comparison purposes, and are not within one mile of the Project.

5.4.1.1 Minority Populations

A Summary of the race and ethnicity for the Affected Environment is presented in Table 5.4-2. Company utilized EJSCREEN to identify minority populations within the Affected Environment. The Fifty Percent and Meaningfully Greater analyses are utilized to evaluate the presence of minority populations. Under the Fifty Percent analysis, a minority population is identified if the percentage of minority individuals within the geographic unit of analysis meets or exceeds 50 percent. Under the Meaningfully Greater analysis, a minority population is identified if the percentage of minority individuals within the geographic unit of analysis is meaningfully greater than the percentage of minorities within a reference community, such as the county, state or nation. For this analysis, the reference population includes primarily the county averages shown in Table 5.4-1, and secondarily the state and national averages discussed in the text.

Within the Affected Environment, there were zero people in Lea County, NM; 38 people in Loving County, two people in Ward County, and one person in Reeves County, TX. The approximate population in Lea County, NM, within the Affected environment is zero; therefore, no further demographic indicators are discussed below for that portion of the Project. Minority populations greater than the county-wide percentages were present in Loving, Ward and Reeves Counties, TX; however, given the significantly low population densities within the affected environment, it is difficult to attach relevance to those percentages (e.g., population equals one in Reeves County).

Based on U.S. Census Bureau 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, the NM state percentage for minority population is 61.8 percent, the TX state percentage is 57.1 percent, and the U.S. percentage is 38.5 percent (2017). Minority populations greater than both the state and U.S. averages were identified in the Affected Environments for the portions of the Project located in Ward, Reeves and Pecos Counties, TX. Similar to the statistical comparisons based on the data detailed directly above, the low population densities within the affected environment make it difficult to attach relevance to those percentages.

5.4-1**ed by and Adjacent to the Project¹**

	Population Reporting Two or More Other Races (%)	Hispanic or Latino Origin ² (%)	Minority (%) ³	Low Income (%)	Speak English Less Than "Very Well" (%)
	1.4	56.8	62.8	16.1	13.1
	0.7	47.5	51.5	14.6	5.7
	2.1	37.5	50.2	21.4	10.7
	4.1	16.2	25.7	17.1	10.8
	0.5	59.4	63.1	17.9	14.5
	0.7	52.2	58.6	11.6	8.8
	0.6	75.0	81.8	13.2	23.0
	1.3	80.7	82.6	29.4	30.3
	0.3	68.5	74.1	11.5	15.3
	0.6	36.2	39.1	6.7	19.1

ot equal 100 percent due to rounding.

arriving in the U.S. People who identify as Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish may be any race.

: not within one mile of the Project.

Table 5.4-2**ographics in the Affected Environment¹**

Population Reporting Two or More Other Races (%)	Total Hispanic or Latino Origin ² (%)	Minority (%) ³	Low Income (%)	Speak English Less Than "Very Well" (%)	Linguistically Isolated Population (%) ⁴
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1.0	35.0	41.0	42.0	4.0	1.0
8.0	16.0	28.0	34.0	12.0	5.0
1.0	77.0	84.0	62.0	48.0	18.0
1.0	77.0	84.0	62.0	48.0	18.0
0.0	69.0	69.0	36.0	15.0	16.0

equal 100 percent due to rounding.

iving in the U.S. People who identify as Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish may be any race.

shaded for minority, low income and speak English less than "very well," columns.

applicable. Much of the area crossed by the Project is rural with low population density. Within the Affected Environment, the analysis area includes zero individuals in Lea County, NM; one individual in Reeves County, TX; two individuals in Ward County, TX; 38 individuals in Loving County, TX; 40 individuals in Pecos County, TX; and 338 individuals in Eddy County, NM. In addition, oil and gas exploration, production and transportation facilities have been in operation in the vicinity of the Project area for decades and the pipeline will be collocated with existing utility ROWs for a majority of the pipeline route.

Communications with property owners impacted by the Project construction will include clear and simple presentation of the purpose and need for the Project and accurately projected construction schedule and anticipated property impacts.

To facilitate public outreach, Company established a Project website (<http://doublepipeline.com/>) and a Public Participation Plan included in Resource Report 8, which outlines a commitment to engage with stakeholders throughout the Project lifecycle.

Impacts to linguistically isolated populations are not expected as the Project does not directly intersect with residential or otherwise concentrated population areas. In addition, every effort will be made to ensure that written and oral communications with any such populations or landowners utilize simple, plain language and pictures if needed to reduce the potential for negative impact to these populations through miscommunication. Company has engaged a third party to help translate to landowners or the public in the linguistically isolated areas, as well as proactively translated the Project Handout, Newsletter, Website and the Notice of Assessment Letter into Spanish to provide if requested. In addition, the following sentence will be placed on all other documents, as well as on the website: "Esta información también está disponible en español, contáctenos en doubleeinfo@summitmidstream.com." This statement translates to: "This information is also available in Spanish, contact us at doubleeinfo@summitmidstream.com"

Company will continue to meet with stakeholders to discuss the ongoing efforts associated with the Project.

- Google. 2018. Google Earth (Version 7) [Computer program]. Accessed January 2019. Available at <https://www.google.com/earth/versions/#download-pro>.
- Hart Energy. 2019. Former US Commerce Secretary To Lead Partnership Helping Permian Basin Residents. Accessed March 2019 from <https://www.hartenergy.com/news/former-us-commerce-secretary-lead-partnership-helping-permian-basin-residents-119126>.
- Hedden, Adrain C. 2019. 400-bed 'man camp' coming to Carlsbad amid oil and gas boom in Permian Basin. El Paso Times. Accessed June 2019 from <https://www.elpasotimes.com/story/news/local/new-mexico/2019/03/03/400-bed-man-camp-coming-carlsbad-new-mexico-amid-oil-and-gas-boom-permian-basing/3049238002/>.
- Jasper, Simone. 2018. Oil Boom Overwhelms Small Town of Pecos, Texas. Santa Fe New Mexican. Accessed January 2019 from http://www.santafenewmexican.com/news/local_news/oil-boom-overwhelms-small-town-of-pecos-texas/article_eed9c5a4-a67e-58d8-b22c-9d8af05393ca.html.
- Lea Regional Medical Center. 2019. Accessed January 2019 from <http://www.learegionalmedical.com/>.
- Loving County Sheriff's Office. 2019. Accessed January 2019 from <https://www.lovingcountytexasheriff.org/sheriff>.
- New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee. 2018a. General Fund Revenue Tracking report: Accruals through September 2018. Accessed March 2019 from https://www.nmlegis.gov/Entity/LFC/Documents/Revenue_Reports/Monthly_Revenue_Tracking/2019/September%202018%20Revenue%20Report.pdf.
- New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee. 2018b. The General Fund. Accessed March 2019 from https://www.nmlegis.gov/Entity/LFC/Documents/Finance_Facts/finance%20facts%20GF.pdf.
- New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee. 2018c. Oil and Natural Gas Revenue. Accessed March 2019 from https://www.nmlegis.gov/Entity/LFC/Documents/Finance_Facts/finance%20facts%20oil%20and%20gas%20revenue.pdf.
- Nor-Lea Hospital District. 2019. Accessed January 2019 from <https://www.nor-lea.org/about-us>.
- Pecos, TX. 2019. Accessed January 2019 from <https://www.pecostx.gov/government/departments/fire-department>.
- Permian Strategic Partnership. 2018. Resilient Growth: Unlocking the Permian Basin's Trillion-Dollar Opportunity.
- Public Schools K12. 2011. Accessed January 2019 from <http://publicschools.k12.com/all-schools/tx/>.
- Reeves County Hospital. 2019. Accessed January 2019 from <http://www.reevescountyhospital.com/>.
- RRC Associates, LLC and WSW Consulting. 2015. City of Hobbs Housing Needs Assessment. Accessed January 2019 from <http://www.edcl.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Hobbs-HNA-FINAL-WITH-APPENDIX-2015.pdf>.

5.5 References

- Adams-Heard, Rachel. 2018a. Welcome to the 'Man Camps' of West Texas. Bloomberg. Accessed January 2019 from <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-08-07/welcome-to-the-man-camps-of-west-texas>.
- Adams-Heard, Rachel. 2018b. Why Moms Are Among Those Hardest Hit By The Permian Basin Employment Boom. Accessed March 2019 from <https://www.dallasnews.com/business/energy/2018/08/22/worst-childcare-waiting-lists-texas-booming-permian-basin>.
- Aries Residence Suites. 2019. Orla, TX. Accessed June 2019 from <https://www.ariesresidencesuites.com/locations/orla-tx/>.
- Beauvais, Sally. 2018. Permian High School is overcrowded; one class has 63 students. MRT. Accessed March 2019 from <https://www.mrt.com/news/education/article/Permian-High-School-is-overcrowded-one-class-has-12812997.php>.
- Blum, Jordan. 2018. Companies, needing Permian workers, find West Texas a hard sell. Houston Chronicle. Accessed March 2019 from <https://www.houstonchronicle.com/business/energy/article/Companies-needing-Permian-workers-find-West-12960385.php>.
- Carlsbad Department of Development. 2017. Carlsbad Housing Report December 2017. Accessed December 2018 from <http://developcarlsbad.org/DocumentCenter/View/1246>.
- Carlsbad Medical Center. 2019. Accessed January 2019 from <https://www.carlsbadmedicalcenter.com/>.
- CBS 7. 2018. Housing Shortage Strikes West Texas. Accessed January 2019 from <https://www.cbs7.com/content/news/Housing-shortage-strikes-West-Texas--478594263.html>.
- City of Monahans. 2019. Accessed January 2019 from https://www.cityofmonahans.org/index.asp?SEC=90D002D7-3B98-4CBA-959A-6CF9750E6067&Type=B_BASIC.
- Crowley, Kevin. 2018a. The Permian Oil Boom is Showing Signs of Overheating. Accessed March 2019 from <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-10-16/the-permian-oil-boom-is-showing-signs-of-overheating>.
- Crowley, Kevin. 2018b. Roads, Not Pipelines, May Be Biggest Threat to Growth in Oil Hotspot. Bloomberg. Accessed November 2018 from <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-09-18/roads-not-pipelines-seen-as-the-biggest-permian-peril-to-growth>.
- Duke University Energy Initiative. 2015. Oil/gas activity boosts economy, government revenue in NM's Permian basin. Accessed March 2019 from <https://energy.duke.edu/content/oilgas-activity-boosts-economy-government-revenue-nm%E2%80%99s-permian-basin>.
- Eddy County, NM. 2019. Accessed January 2019 from <https://www.co.eddy.nm.us/161/Fire-Service>.
- Google. 2019. Google Maps. Accessed January 2019 from <https://www.google.com/maps>.

Matthews, Christopher M., and Elliott, Rebecca. 2019. In This Oil Boom Town, Even a Barber Can Make \$180,000. Wall Street Journal. Accessed March 2019 from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/in-this-oil-boom-town-even-a-barber-can-make-180-000-11551436210>.

Worland, Justin. 2019. How an Oil Boom in West Texas Is Reshaping the World. Accessed March 2019 from <http://time.com/5492648/permian-oil-boom-west-texas/>.

- Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. 2018. Comptroller Raises Revenue Estimate by More than \$2.8 Billion. Accessed March 2019 from <https://comptroller.texas.gov/about/media-center/news/2018/180711-cre.php>.
- Texas Standard. 2018. Ever Heard Of Severance Tax? It's How Texas Makes Money Off Oil And Gas Drilling. Accessed March 2019 from <http://www.texasstandard.org/stories/ever-heard-of-severance-tax-its-how-texas-makes-money-off-oil-and-gas-drilling/>.
- Texas Tribune. 2018. Hey, Texplainer: How does Texas' budget use taxes from oil and natural gas production? Accessed March 2019 from <https://www.texastribune.org/2018/01/05/hey-texplainer-how-does-texas-budget-use-taxes-oil-and-natural-gas-pro/>.
- United States Census Bureau. 2017. 2017 Population Estimate (as of July 1, 2017). Accessed January 2019 from <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>.
- United States Census Bureau. 2017. 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Accessed January 2019 from <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>.
- United States Census Bureau. 2015. Tiger/Line Shapefile, 2015, Nation, U.S., Primary Roads National Shapefile. Accessed February 2019 from <https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/tiger-line-shapefile-2015-nation-u-s-primary-roads-national-shapefile>.
- United States Census Bureau. 2014. Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates. Accessed October 2018 from <https://www.census.gov/did/www/saipe/data/index.html>.
- United States Census Bureau. 2010. 2010 Census. Accessed January 2019 from <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>.
- United States Department of Labor. 2018. BLS Data Viewer. Accessed March 2019 from <https://beta.bls.gov/dataViewer/view>.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2016. Promising Practices for EJ Methodologies in NEPA Reviews. Accessed October 2018 from https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-08/documents/nepa_promising_practices_document_2016.pdf.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2018. EJSCREEN. Accessed October 2018 from www.epa.gov/ejscreen.
- US Hospital Finder. 2019. Accessed January 2019 from <http://www.ushospitalfinder.com/>.
- USA Cops. 2018. Texas and New Mexico. Accessed January 2019 from <https://www.usacops.com/>.
- USA Fire & Rescue. 2018. Accessed January 2019 from <https://www.usafireandrescue.com/>.
- Wethe, David. 2018. Some Permian Basin workers get 100 percent pay raises as oil boom creates labor shortage. Dallas News. Accessed March 2019 from <https://www.dallasnews.com/business/energy/2018/06/06/permian-basin-employers-offer-100-percent-pay-raises-oil-boom-sucks-workers>.