

RECORD OF DECISION

USDA-Rural Development's Rural Housing Service is issuing this Record of Decision for:

Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the
MINIDOKA DAM SPILLWAY REPLACEMENT

Decision and Reasons for the Decision

US Department of Agriculture, Rural Housing Service (RHS), Community Facilities Program, is considering an application from irrigation districts in Idaho for direct loans, the proceeds of which would be used for partial financing of the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) project to correct structural problems at the Minidoka Dam spillway and canal headworks located on Lake Walcott, Idaho. RHS requires an environmental analysis in compliance with its National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations at 7 CFR 1940-G, prior to a decision on any approval of the loan application. RHS cooperated with the US Department of Interior (DOI), Bureau of Reclamation, in preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). The proposed project assessed by DOI in the FEIS is substantially the same as the proposed action for the RHS Community Facilities Program. By this Record of Decision (ROD) today, RHS is selecting that alternative in the FEIS which was the preferred alternative, also described as Alternative B – Spillway and Headworks Replacement.

Background

The existing spillway and canal headworks are showing considerable signs of degradation. Following construction, Reclamation proposes to modify current operations to increase power production since the reservoir can be held at a higher level during the winter. In addition to correcting the structural problems of the existing spillway and canal headworks, Reclamation is also proposing to designate Special Use Areas at the project site in accordance with 43 CFR Part 423 Regulations, *Public Conduct on Bureau of Reclamation Facilities, Lands, and Waterbodies*. These Special Use Areas will define what public uses are allowed in close proximity to the dam, spillway, and other facilities.

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to prevent structural failure of the Minidoka Dam spillway and canal headworks (proposed action area). After 103 years of continual use, the 2,237-foot-long concrete spillway has reached the end of its functional lifespan. Additionally, previous ice damage to the overflow section of the spillway requires that the reservoir water level be dropped each winter. The current conditions of the Minidoka Dam spillway and headworks present increasingly difficult reliability and maintenance problems. Reclamation must be able to continue to meet its contractual obligations for water delivery, power generation, and commitments to provide flow augmentation water under the Nez Perce Settlement Agreement and the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

Further, in order to allow traditional uses that are appropriate but are not currently allowed, Reclamation has determined that it would be in the best public interest to identify Special Use Areas for some of these traditional uses as provided under the rules and regulations.

Applicable laws, regulations, and policies

The overall regulations for implementing NEPA are in 40 CFR Part 1500 of the Council on Environmental Quality provides that Agencies may cooperate in the preparation of an EIS; RD Instruction 1940.325 further provides for cooperation between RD and a lead agency in conducting the appropriate environmental impact statement. RD may use the FEIS prepared by the lead agency as its own with the following stipulations:

- 1- Written correspondence dated June 2, 2010 was provided from RD to DOI indicating a desire and agreement to participate as a cooperating agency; and
- 2- RD has determined that the FEIS adequately addresses RD's concerns.

It is the conclusion of RD environmental personnel that the DOI FEIS meets the requirements of Subpart 1940 that the actions evaluated in the FEIS are substantially the same as those proposed to RD for a loan.

Alternatives

The FEIS considered Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, Alternative B – Spillway and Headworks Replacement and Alternative C – Spillway Replacement. The primary difference between Alternatives B and C was inclusion of the headworks in the project,

Alternative B is considered to be the environmentally-preferred alternative because it limits the impact of construction by eliminating the need for significant maintenance and replacement actions over a long period of time in several efforts. The environmental impacts related to construction occur only once during the accomplishment of the Proposed Action. Because of this, and with the environmental commitments to adaptively manage the change in spillway flows, this alternative is environmentally preferred.

Alternative B – Spillway and Headworks Replacement (Preferred Alternative)

This alternative, described in detail in the FEIS, involves partial removal of the existing spillway and headworks and construction of a new spillway, headworks, and other features. In addition, Special Use Areas will be designated to accommodate some of the historic uses of the area. This alternative consists of the following new structures and improvements:

Spillway

Overflow Section. New overflow sections will be constructed entirely downstream of the existing spillway. By constructing downstream, the existing spillway can be used as a

cofferdam during construction and until completion of the new spillway. Following completion of the new spillway, partial demolition of the existing spillway will be completed. The demolition will include removal of the metal walkway and handrails, and removal of the concrete piers above the ogee section. Best management practices (BMPs), such as the use of silt curtains or other appropriate sediment control actions, will be employed to control sediment releases during removal in order to protect water quality and endangered snail habitat.

Radial Gate Sections. New radial gate sections will be constructed entirely downstream of the existing spillway and have been modeled after the existing radial gates at Minidoka Dam. It is anticipated that blasting will be required to remove rock for the foundation of the new radial gate sections and to improve the channel upstream and downstream.

Dike. New dike sections will be constructed downstream of the existing spillway and will be constructed of roller-compacted concrete faced with structural concrete.

Headworks. The new South Side Canal headworks will be reconstructed in the existing canal about 300 feet downstream of the existing headworks, and the new North Side Canal headworks will be reconstructed in the existing canal about 115 feet downstream of the existing headworks. Following completion of the new headworks, the majority of the existing structure, including metalwork, will be removed. The southern-most bay will remain as support for the embankment endwall.

Public Use Improvements Currently, substantial fishing and birding opportunities exist in association with the existing spillway. Under Alternative B, some fishing and birding opportunities will be eliminated as a result of structural limitations and the closure of the new spillway and canal headgates to public access. Reclamation proposes to alter the existing spillway access bridge to meet current accessibility standards. This bridge crosses the pool below where the new radial gate sections will be located and is currently open to non-vehicular public use such as fishing and birding. Additionally, a parking area that is accessible to people with disabilities will be provided near the south end of the bridge.

Special Use Areas Reclamation will designate Special Use Areas as provided for in 43 CFR Part 423 in order to allow historic recreational uses to continue that will otherwise be prohibited, but will restrict uses which affect public safety. The Special Use Areas will allow for wading and float tubing associated with fishing and birding, and ice fishing within specific portions of the 300-yard zone currently closed to such activities.

Environmental Issues/Impacts

Table 1 (attached) summarizes the impacts of the proposed Minidoka Dam project compared to the No Action Alternative.

The following list identifies the major environmental issues identified during the NEPA process.

- Potential impacts to ESA-listed snails resulting from a decrease in spillway flows.
- Potential impacts to spillway wetlands resulting from reduction in spillway flows.
- Potential impacts to water fowl and shoreline vegetation resulting from keeping the reservoir at full level following construction.
- Potential impacts to water quality during construction.

These issues resulted in incorporating changes to the action alternatives in the Final EIS. These changes commit Reclamation to: 1) development and use of a Technical Advisory Team that will make recommendations on appropriate monitoring needs and resultant mitigation if needed; 2) a 4-year incremental reduction in spillway releases, combined with monitoring, using an adaptive management approach to determining appropriate changes in spillway releases; and 3) retain the flexibility to draft reservoir levels to elevation 4240.0 feet during the winter to address irrigation demand, facility maintenance needs, and environmental concerns.

Mitigation Measures

A monitoring program, overseen by the Technical Advisory Team comprised of multiple stakeholders, will form the basis of an adaptive management approach to both construction and operation of the dam. This program will ensure monitoring of spillway and reservoir impacts to fish and wildlife species including muskrat, beaver, leopard frogs, invasive species and the spillway trout fishery. RHS is in accord with the approach to mitigation of impacts and recommends that the recipients of RHS financial assistance, the irrigation districts, include in any agreement with DOI, the requirement to include RHS, Idaho State Office, Community Facilities Program, in circulation of all monitoring reports.

Identification of environmental document(s) considered in making the decision

U. S. Department of the Interior, *Minidoka Dam Spillway Replacement*, Final Environmental Impact Statement, August, 2010

U. S. Department of the Interior, *Minidoka Dam Spillway Replacement*, Record of Decision, September, 2010

USDA, Rural Development, *Letter of June 2, 2010 from Rob Nelson, Acting Director of Program Support Staff to Allyn Meuleman, U. S. Department of the Interior (Agreement to Participate as a Cooperating Agency)*.

Public involvement conducted

Public involvement conducted by DOI is consistent with RHS regulation and included the following:

November 13, 2008. Reclamation published a "Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement" in the Federal Register on (FR 73 67206). A scoping letter was mailed to 106 individuals, organizations, agencies, and congressional delegates. The letter discussed the project and served as notification of the future public scoping meetings. A similar letter was sent to 28 tribal governments.

December 2008. Public scoping meetings were held in Burley and Idaho Falls in to provide information to the public and to solicit input on the alternatives developed to address replacement of the Minidoka Dam spillway and associated structures.

April 2009. Reclamation also held a meeting with the Fort Hall Business Council of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes at the Fort Hall Reservation followed by a public meeting in the evening.

Reclamation received only five written letters of comment as a result of the public scoping meeting. The comment period closed December 19, 2008. A Scoping Report was furnished to those providing comments and was included in the Draft and Final EISs.

In December 2009, the Draft EIS was mailed to 95 individuals, organizations, agencies, and congressional delegates for their review and comment. A similar letter was sent to 28 tribal governments. Written comments were accepted through February 5, 2010. Twelve letters of comment were received.

Public meetings were held at the following locations to obtain both written and oral comments.

- January 12 – Idaho Falls, Idaho
- January 13 – Pocatello, Idaho
- January 14 – Burley, Idaho

Responses to oral and written comments are included in the Final EIS.

Timing of Action

In accordance with 40 CFR 1506.3 and RD Instruction 1940.325(e), the DOI FEIS, in which RHS is a cooperating agency, may be used to substantiate RHS's assessment of potential environmental impacts. The FEIS has been available for over 30 days, and all public comments have been addressed therein. RHS has fulfilled its NEPA responsibilities and through this Record of Decision recommends the proposal for direct loans to irrigation districts to provide financial support for Replacement of the Spillway and Headworks of the Minikoka Dam, , also described as Alternative B in the July, 2011 FIES, as the preferred alternative.

Prepared by:  9/8/2011
ANNIE EBERHART GOODE Date
Environmental Protection Specialist, Program Support Staff

Recommended:  9/8/2011
LINDA J. RODGERS Date
Director, Program Support Staff

Recommended:  09/08/2011
JOSEPH BEN-ISRAEL Date
Director, Community Programs, Rural Housing Service

Approved:  9-15-11
TAMMYE TREVINO Date
Administrator, Rural Housing Service

Attachment:

Table 1: Summary of Environmental Impacts by Alternative

Excerpted from DOI Record of Decision, *Spillway and Headworks Replacement, Minidoka Dam*, August, 2010

Attachment A

Summary Table – Comparison of Alternatives

Resource	Alternative A – No Action	Alternative B – Spillway and Headworks Replacement	Alternative C – Spillway Replacement
<p>Hydrology and Reservoir Operations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lake Walcott Target Elevations • Target Flows below Minidoka Dam (includes both powerplant and spillway flows measured at the USGS gage) • Spillway Flow Targets 	<p>4245.0 feet (April through October)</p> <p>4240.0 feet (November through March)</p> <p>500 cfs</p> <p>April 15 through June 30 – 1,300 cfs</p> <p>July 1 through August 31 – 1,900 cfs</p> <p>September 1 through September 15 – 1,300 cfs</p> <p>April 1 through April 14 and September 16 through October 31 - first 5,035 cfs through the powerplant</p> <p>Next 1,300 cfs over the existing spillway additional flows above a total of 6,335 cfs through powerplant until hydraulic capacity reached, then excess flow is discharged over the existing spillway</p> <p>November through March – 0 cfs</p>	<p>Dry water type years: 4245.0 feet (March through August)</p> <p>Dry water type years: 4240.0 feet (September through February)</p> <p>Average/wet water type years: 4245.0 feet (year round)</p> <p>Dry water type years: 525 cfs.</p> <p>Average/wet water type years: 600 cfs</p> <p>April through October - minimum of at least 500 cfs up to 1,900 cfs based upon monitoring; to be established Year 4 after spillway construction.</p> <p>An adaptive management approach would be taken to establish the minimum flow within the spillway area. The target minimum spillway flow of 500 cfs would be incrementally pursued at over a 4-year period. This would allow Reclamation to assess potential impacts to the biological resources within the spillway area. The proposed incremental reduction in spillway flows would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year 1 – 1,900 cfs • Year 2 – 1,500 cfs • Year 3 – 1,000 cfs • Year 4 – 500 cfs <p>November through March – up to 100 cfs) if determined to be needed.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p> <p>Same as Alternative B.</p> <p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

Resource	Alternative A – No Action	Alternative B – Spillway and Headworks Replacement	Alternative C – Spillway Replacement
Groundwater	Continuation of current groundwater conditions, groundwater levels, and subsurface seepage flows.	In years when Lake Walcott is held full during the winter months, total measured subsurface seepage volume would increase by about 4 percent downstream of the north abutment (maximum measured seepage is 860 gpm). Water levels in the sand interbed would increase by about 1.5 feet and basalt water levels would increase by about a foot. Water levels in the regional basalt aquifer would remain below the elevation of the Snake River so there would be no change of flow between the river and aquifer.	Same as Alternative B.
Water Quality	Reservoir bank erosion and upstream reach (in-channel) suspension of sediment during drawdown would continue. No change in downstream reach.	Brief periods of elevated turbidity in the spillway area due to construction activities; no change in downstream reaches. Slight sediment delivery reduction from upstream reaches.	Same as Alternative B.
Minidoka Hydropower Generation	No change.	Increase in gross generation and economic value.	Same as Alternative B.
Aquatic Biota Reservoir Fish Community	Extensive areas of aquatic macrophytes along the littoral zone of Lake Walcott provide good spawning and rearing habitat and protection from predation. However the lengthy drawdown period during winter can force juveniles from the cover of aquatic macrophytes, as well as lava rock and boulders, increasing their exposure to predation. While this can increase prey availability for large predators, it can reduce overall juvenile survival of species such as smallmouth bass.	The change in reservoir operations would not adversely affect aquatic macrophytes which provide spawning and rearing habitat and cover from predation. Juvenile fish that rely on the cover of aquatic macrophytes or lava rock and boulder habitat for predator escape would benefit through the reduced period of reservoir drawdown. Overall there would be a benefit to the fish community in general and smallmouth bass in particular because of the reduction in drawdowns and improved juvenile survival. Approximately 5.2 acres of reservoir habitat would be created.	Same as Alternative B.
Spillway Fish Community	No effect to the fish species present in the spillway area will occur.	With proper implementation of BMPs there would be no adverse construction impacts. Replacing the flows that occur as a result of leakage with pipes that would deliver a minimum of 500 cfs in summer and flows provided in winter would allow a similar fish population to continue in the spillway area. Spillway target flows to be established Year 4 after spillway	Same as Alternative B.

Resource	Alternative A – No Action	Alternative B – Spillway and Headworks Replacement	Alternative C – Spillway Replacement
		<p>construction based upon monitoring. Minimum 500 cfs up to 1,900 cfs.</p> <p>Fish entrainment rates would be similar to the present condition.</p>	
<p>Terrestrial Biota</p> <p>Vegetation</p> <p>Spillway Wetlands</p>	<p>Existing upland and riparian vegetation will not change and will not be disturbed by construction except for maintenance and the gradual replacement of piers.</p> <p>There will be no changes in wetland function or extent.</p>	<p>Little or no change to existing upland and riparian vegetation although cottonwoods would be at risk due to an increase in muskrat and beaver populations.</p> <p>More stable water levels would allow better control of trespass grazing on the Minidoka Refuge by reducing the opportunity for cattle to go around fences during reservoir drawdown. No effects to noxious weed control efforts with the exception of Eurasian milfoil which may increase because of the reduced winter drawdown and subsequent freezing. Spring full pool may allow better survival of riparian plantings. Drawdowns are generally beneficial for emergent vegetation which exists in the drawdown zone of the reservoir. Overall extent of emergent vegetation should not be affected. Reduction of approximately 5.2 acres of spillway habitat.</p> <p>Reservoir wetlands – 5-foot winter draft 25 to 50 percent of years with April refill and year-round full pool operation rest of years would not adversely affect emergent vegetation in the reservoir littoral zone. Creation of approximately 5.2 acres of reservoir habitat.</p> <p>Spillway area habitat would be sustained by utilizing the 4 new pipes and the radial gates to provide a minimum spillway flow between 500 and 1,900 cfs in summer and some potential over-winter flows up to 100 cfs, as determined by monitoring results and adaptive management.</p> <p>The construction of the new headgates would primarily be completed outside the wetland so would have little impact</p> <p>Three acres of wetland habitat in the spillway area would be eliminated with the construction of the new spillway and service road. Reclamation will mitigate on a one-to-one basis for wetland losses</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p> <p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

Resource	Alternative A – No Action	Alternative B – Spillway and Headworks Replacement	Alternative C – Spillway Replacement
<p>Avian, Mammalian, Amphibian, and Reptile Communities</p>	<p>No changes in the wildlife community would occur.</p>	<p>Little or no effect to avian communities, except temporary disturbance of birds in the construction area. No effect to large mobile wildlife such as deer and antelope. Muskrat and beaver populations would likely increase. Increasing beaver populations may put the few cottonwoods at risk. Elimination of winter drawdown would likely benefit amphibians.</p> <p>Wildlife species would be temporarily disturbed during the approximate 31 months of construction and may experience some increased mortality due to collisions with heavy equipment on the haul road, or as a result of displacement to already occupied habitats. The presence of humans may also cause some wildlife species to avoid the area while construction is taking place. Avoidance of the area by some species should change when construction is completed and the construction noise stops.</p> <p>Blasting to remove rock in the spillway area is likely to result in temporary adverse impacts to reptiles and amphibians including mortality of any individuals in the immediate area of the blasting activities.</p>	<p>Under Alternative C the new headworks would not be built only the existing spillway sections would be constructed.</p> <p>These would primarily be completed outside the wetland and should have no impact.</p>
<p>Threatened and Endangered Species</p> <p>Spillway Flow</p>	<p>Operations – No winter release; 1,300 to 1,900 cfs irrigation season</p> <p>No change in habitat for, ESA-listed snails, bald eagle, or Yellow-billed Cuckoo habitat.</p> <p>No construction.</p>	<p>Operations – Provide potential winter flows of up to 100 cfs; 500 cfs to 1,900 minimum in summer, based on monitoring and adaptive management.</p> <p>2005 BiOp operations – Summer reduction.</p> <p>Construction – Flows maintained consistent with current operations; increased sediments possible.</p> <p>5.2 acres converted from spillway habitat to permanently watered reservoir habitat.</p> <p>ESA-listed snail – Likely to adversely affect.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

Resource	Alternative A – No Action	Alternative B – Spillway and Headworks Replacement	Alternative C – Spillway Replacement
Flood Plain	Under continuance of existing spillway and powerplant operating conditions at the site no new impacts on the existing flood plain are anticipated.	During flood control releases that result in higher spillway flows the increased discharge may redistribute bedload sediments in the river but would not adversely impact the flood plain areas.	Similar impacts as Alternative B.
Cultural Resources	<p>Spillway replacement will not be implemented; no immediate effect on the historic dam. However, no action could result in major changes later from repairs that will affect the dam's National Register status.</p> <p>There will be no effect on archaeological sites.</p>	<p>Impacts from removal of original components of the historic dam would include: the existing spillway, the historic bridge at the North Side Canal, the South Side Canal headworks, and the historic lining material on the North Side Canal.</p> <p>Additional impacts would result from introducing new elements: new overflow sections downstream of the existing spillway; new North Side Canal and South Side Canal headworks structures; new North Side Canal lining; a new radial gate section with 12 radial gate bays; accessible parking area and security fences; new service roads; and new concrete dikes. These new elements adversely affect the integrity and historic environment of the dam.</p> <p>Of the three alternatives, Alternative B would have the greatest impact to the dam's historic integrity.</p> <p>There would be no effect on archaeological sites.</p>	<p>Impacts to dam integrity would be at a reduced scale relative to Alternative B.</p> <p>Impacts from removal of original components of the historic dam would include removal of the existing spillway.</p> <p>Impacts from introducing new elements would include: new overflow sections; a new radial gate section; accessible parking area and security fences; new service roads; and new concrete dikes. These new elements would adversely affect the integrity and historic environment of the dam.</p> <p>There would be no effect on archaeological sites.</p>
Indian Trust Assets (ITAs)	No change, assets will not be affected.	Alternative B would temporarily affect fishing and hunting rights in the direct vicinity of the new spillway and canal headworks during construction. These fishing and hunting rights would be restored at project completion	Same as Alternative B.
Sacred Sites	No known sites in the area; therefore, sacred sites will not be affected.	There are no known Indian sacred sites in the area of the existing spillway or the adjacent area surrounding the project. There is potential of uncovering a sacred location if the water is dropped below normal management levels for the spillway replacement. No impacts are expected from the construction work when replacing the headworks.	Same as Alternative B.
Recreation	Use restrictions in 43 CFR Part 423 would be in place indefinitely.	Ice fishing use would be permitted but would shift northeastward; bank fishing from the existing dike would cease if private landowner denied public access; no access	Same as Alternative B.

Resource	Alternative A – No Action	Alternative B – Spillway and Headworks Replacement	Alternative C – Spillway Replacement
		<p>would be provided to the new dike; all recreation using spillway catwalk access would cease; fishing would be available from banks immediately below outflow points of both the existing radial gates and the new radial gates; more difficult to access south side of river; public access to the south half of area below the new spillway including existing radial gates improved; accessible parking constructed and fishing access improved for people with disabilities, which could result in increased visitation below the new spillway.</p>	
Aesthetics	<p>No change except short-term impacts during occasional pier replacement construction.</p>	<p>Short-term impacts associated with construction of the new spillway and headworks. New spillway would have less visual impact than existing spillway.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
Noise	<p>Temporary noise and groundborne vibration generated by equipment and machinery associated with pier replacement and headworks maintenance will attenuate to acceptable levels at the park and private residences. The pier replacement program will involve ongoing replacement of piers to maintain the existing spillway in a usable condition. The ongoing maintenance period will likely last a few weeks to months. Noise impacts associated with implementation will be temporary and less than significant.</p> <p>Following maintenance noise levels will be the same as the current condition; therefore, there would be no operational noise impact.</p> <p>Noise impacts are localized in nature and decrease substantially with distance. No other construction projects are currently located or expected in the immediate vicinity of Minidoka Dam. Therefore, pier replacement and headworks maintenance will not contribute to</p>	<p>Potential temporary noise and groundborne vibration impacts generated by equipment and machinery used during construction of the new spillway and headworks replacement would attenuate to acceptable levels at the park and private residences. Replacement of the spillway and headworks would take approximately 31 months. Noise impacts associated with implementation would be temporary and less than significant.</p> <p>Following construction noise levels would be the same as the current condition; therefore, there would be no operational noise impact.</p> <p>Noise impacts are localized in nature and decrease substantially with distance. No other construction projects are currently located or expected in the immediate vicinity of Minidoka Dam. Therefore, replacement of the existing spillway and headworks would not contribute to cumulative construction noise impacts.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

Resource	Alternative A – No Action	Alternative B – Spillway and Headworks Replacement	Alternative C – Spillway Replacement
	cumulative construction noise impacts.		
Air Quality	<p>Potential air quality impacts would be associated with pier replacement and headworks maintenance under the No Action alternative over the life of the project.</p> <p>Compliance with all applicable DEQ emission standards and BMPs would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. Air quality impacts associated with pier replacement and existing headworks maintenance are localized in nature and decrease substantially with distance. No other construction projects are currently located or expected in the immediate vicinity of Minidoka Dam.</p> <p>Air quality following maintenance would be the same as the current condition; therefore, there would be no operational air quality impact.</p>	<p>Potential air quality impacts would be associated with construction of the new spillway and headworks during the construction period of approximately 31 months.</p> <p>Compliance with all applicable DEQ emission standards and BMPs including those for operation of portable rock crushers, and concrete and/or asphalt batch plants would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. Thus air quality impacts associated with Alternative B would be temporary and less than significant.</p> <p>Air quality impacts associated with the construction of the new spillway and headworks are localized in nature and decrease substantially with distance. No other construction projects are currently located or expected in the immediate vicinity of Minidoka Dam.</p> <p>Air quality following construction would be the same as the current condition; therefore, there would be no operational air quality impact.</p>	Same as Alternative B.
Socioeconomics	<p>No construction related impacts.</p> <p>Annual O&M related expenditures will increase resulting in 3 jobs, \$292,300 of output, and \$111,700 of labor income.</p>	<p>Construction-related expenditures, mainly due to wage earners spending, result in 291 jobs, \$28.5 million in output, and \$10.0 million in labor income. These impacts are spread over the construction period.</p> <p>Annual O&M expenditures result in 1 job, \$74,600 output, and \$28,500 labor income; all categories of impacts are less than No Action.</p>	<p>Construction-related expenditures, mainly due to wage earners spending, result in 204 jobs, \$20 million in output, and \$7.0 million in labor income. These impacts are spread over the construction period.</p> <p>Annual O&M expenditures result in 1 job, \$86,000 output, \$32,900 and labor income, all categories of impacts are less than No Action.</p>
Environmental Justice	No disproportionate adverse human health or environmental impacts on minority and/or low-income populations have been identified.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.