

3.10 SOCIOECONOMICS

This section describes existing socioeconomic conditions and evaluates the potential socioeconomic impacts that may result from the Project. The resource topics used to describe the existing socioeconomic conditions include:

- Population;
- Housing and property values;
- Local economic activity measured primarily by employment and income;
- Tax revenues;
- Public services; and
- Environmental justice.

The socioeconomic topics identified as potentially impacted, either positively or negatively, by the proposed Project include:

- Compensation to property owners for ROW easements, restrictions on land use and damage to property;
- Construction worker demands on local infrastructure;
- Creation of local area jobs;
- Economic benefits from the purchase of goods and services during construction and operations; and
- Fiscal impacts associated with property, sales and other tax revenues, as well as public service costs generated by the proposed Project.

3.10.1 Environmental Setting

This section provides a general overview of the socioeconomic resources that could be affected by the Project and represents existing (or current) socioeconomic conditions in the Project area. Further, it provides context to the analysis of socioeconomic impacts and establishes baseline conditions against which the potential socioeconomic impacts of the proposed Project were evaluated. The data used to establish baseline socioeconomic conditions derive from a variety of federal, state, and local sources. Both text and tables in this section are organized by Project area (e.g., Segment, Pump Station or Lateral), state, and county.

3.10.1.1 Region of Influence

The proposed Project in the U.S. would consist of a 1,380 mile pipeline and ancillary facilities, as described in Section 2.0. From its point of entry into the United States near Morgan, Montana the proposed pipeline would cross 59 counties in six states. From north to south the states are Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas (see Table 3.10.1-1).

TABLE 3.10.1-1 States and Counties within the Project Area		
Segment/State	Number of Counties	Counties
Steel City Segment		
Montana	6	Phillips, Valley, McCone, Dawson, Prairie, Fallon
South Dakota	9	Harding, Butte, Perkins, Meade, Pennington, Haakon, Jones, Lyman, Tripp
Nebraska	14	Keya Paha, Rock, Holt, Garfield, Wheeler, Greeley, Boone, Nance, Merrick, Hamilton, York, Fillmore, Saline, Jefferson
Pump Station		
Kansas	2	Clay, Butler
Gulf Coast Segment		
Oklahoma	9	Atoka, Bryan, Coal, Creek, Hughes, Lincoln, Okfuskee, Payne, Seminole
Texas	16	Angelina, Cherokee, Delta, Fannin, Franklin, Hardin, Hopkins, Jefferson, Lamar, Liberty, Nacogdoches, Polk, Rusk, Smith, Upshur, Wood
Houston Lateral		
Texas	3	Liberty, Chambers, Harris

Source: Keystone 2009c.

Within each county, several local communities are expected to incur most of the direct socioeconomic impacts of the Project, both positive and negative. Communities located with 0.5 miles to 2.0 miles of the proposed pipeline are listed in Table 3.10.1-2. However, for the purposes of the analysis information to describe the environmental setting is reported at the County versus community level. The determination to develop the analysis at the County versus community level is based on the following factors:

- The rural nature of the majority of the potentially affected environment limits the availability of consistent data below the County level.
- Project economic impacts may occur in towns further away than 2 miles from the pipeline.
- In communities that are not predominately rural, such as Houston, located in Harris County Texas, the economic impacts of building and operating the proposed pipeline are relatively small.

Several types of socioeconomic effects could occur within the region of influence, as described in more detail in the impact analysis presented in Section 3.10.2. Temporary effects during construction of the proposed Project could include changes in population levels or local demographics, changes in the demand for housing and public services, disruption of local transportation corridors, increased employment opportunities and related labor income benefits, and increased government revenues associated with sales and payroll taxes. Isolated impacts on individual property owners and economic land use also could occur along the pipeline route. The primary socioeconomic impacts associated with long-term operation of the proposed Project likely would include employment and income benefits resulting from long-term staffing requirements and local operating expenditures, as well as an increased property tax base and associated tax revenues. Long-term impacts could include impacts to property owners if there is any decrease in land value or usefulness as a result of the pipeline. However, tilled agricultural land would still be useable after construction, according to Keystone.

**TABLE 3.10.1-2
Communities Within 2 Miles of the Proposed Project**

Community	County	Proximity to Project (miles)
Steele City Segment		
Montana		
Nashua	Valley	2
Circle	McCone	2
Baker	Fallon	2
South Dakota		
Buffalo	Harding	2
Midland	Haakon	2
Draper	Jones	2
Winner	Tripp	2
Nebraska		
Ericson	Wheeler	2
Hordville	Hamilton	2
McCool Junction	York	2
Exeter	Fillmore	2
Milligan	Fillmore	2
Western	Saline	2
Steele City	Jefferson	2
Pump Stations - Kansas		
Towanda	Butler	0.5
Potwin	Butler	0.5
Augusta ³	Butler	2
Douglass ³	Butler	2
Wakefield ³	Clay	2
Green	Clay	2
Gulf Coast Segment		
Oklahoma		
Stroud	Creek	2
Paden	Okfuskee	2
Boley	Okfuskee	2
Wewoka	Seminole	2
Allen	Pontotoc	2
Allen	Hughes	2
Atoka	Atoka	2
Tushka	Atoka	2
Caney	Atoka	2

**TABLE 3.10.1-2
Communities Within 2 Miles of the Proposed Project**

Community	County	Proximity to Project (miles)
Texas		
Arp	Smith	0.5
Beaumont	Jefferson	0.5
Port Arthur	Jefferson	0.5
Central Gardens	Jefferson	0.5
Nederland	Jefferson	0.5
China	Jefferson	2
Port Neches	Jefferson	2
Tira	Hopkins	2
Winnsboro	Franklin	2
Winnsboro	Wood	2
Big Sandy	Upshur	2
Reklaw	Rusk	2
Wells	Cherokee	2
Hudson	Angelina	2
Diboll	Angelina	2
Corrigan	Polk	2
Houston Lateral		
Texas		
Hardin	Liberty	2
Liberty	Chambers	2
Ames	Harris	0.5
Mont Belvieu	Chambers	0.5
Barrett	Harris	0.5
Highlands	Harris	2
Channelview	Harris	2
Sheldon	Harris	2
Houston	Harris	0.5

States and counties are listed geographically from north to south as the proposed Project crosses the area.
Source: Keystone 2008.

3.10.1.2 Population

Population-related characteristics in the region of socioeconomic influence are summarized in Table 3.10.1-3 and Table 3.10.1-4. The state populations for those states in which the Project would be constructed are shown in Table 3.10.1-3. For reference the U.S. population is also included in Table 3.10.1-3. The annual average increase in population for the period 2000 to 2007 was 0.9 percent for the nation. Every state except Texas experienced an average annual population growth lower than the federal

annual average – ranging between 0.5 percent and 0.8 percent. Texas’ annual average population growth was 1.9 percent between 2000 and 2007.

TABLE 3.10.1-3 State Population			
Geographic Area	Population		Annual Average Percent Change
	2000	2007	
U.S.	282,171,936	301,290,332	0.9%
States			
Montana	903,283	956,624	0.7%
South Dakota	755,657	795,689	0.8%
Nebraska	1,713,194	1,769,473	0.5%
Kansas	2,688,418	2,777,382	0.5%
Oklahoma	3,453,861	3,608,123	0.6%
Texas	20,946,049	23,843,432	1.9%

Source: U.S. Census Population, Population change and estimated components of population change: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2008 (NST-EST2008-alldata).

The Project route is predominantly rural and sparsely populated, with the population tending to increase from north to south along the route. The total population in the counties comprising the region of influence was over 5.7 million in 2007 (see Table 3.10.1-4). Texas comprised 5.0 million, with 3.9 million of those people living in Harris County where Houston is located. The remainder of the population was distributed across counties that would be traversed by the Project in the other five states as follows: 23,747 in Montana, 146,320 in South Dakota, 85,207 in Nebraska, 71,570 in Kansas, and 323,738 in Oklahoma. The population densities in these five counties range from less than 1 person per square mile to 99 people per square mile. Population densities in Texas are slightly greater, ranging from 10 people per square mile (Coal County) to 1,967 people per square mile (Harris County). These population figures demonstrate the relatively rural nature of the proposed Project area.

In addition to being rural and sparsely populated, the counties within the Project area have experienced relatively low to negative population growth between 2000 and 2007. The counties located within the Project area in Montana and Nebraska experienced a reduction in population ranging from 2.5 percent to 0.1 percent between 2000 and 2007. The counties within the Project route in Kansas, South Dakota and Oklahoma experienced an average annual increase in population for the same time period ranging from 0.6 percent to 0.7 percent. The majority of the average annual population growth occurred in Texas, which experienced a 1.7 percent average annual increase in population between 2000 and 2007 (see Table 3.10.1-4).

TABLE 3.10.1-4 County Population and Population Density				
County	Population		Annual Average % Change	Density per Sq. Mile
	Population 2000	Population 2007		
Steele City Segment				
Montana				
Phillips	4,601	3,934	-2.2%	<1

**TABLE 3.10.1-4
County Population and Population Density**

County	Population		Annual Average % Change	Density per Sq. Mile
	Population 2000	Population 2007		
Valley	7,675	6,884	-1.5%	2
McCone	1,977	1,716	-2.0%	1
Dawson	9,059	8,554	-0.8%	4
Prairie	1,199	1,043	-2.0%	<1
Fallon	1,695	1,616	-0.7%	2
<i>Subtotal Montana</i>	<i>26,206</i>	<i>23,747</i>	<i>-1.4%</i>	
South Dakota				
Harding	1,353	1,173	-2.0%	<1
Butte	9,094	9,449	0.5%	4
Perkins	3,369	2,907	-2.1%	1
Meade	24,245	24,057	-0.1%	7
Pennington	88,573	96,230	1.2%	32
Haakon	2,196	1,842	-2.5%	1
Jones	1,193	1,047	-1.8%	1
Lyman	3,895	3,882	0.0%	2
Tripp	6,430	5,733	-1.6%	4
<i>Subtotal South Dakota</i>	<i>140,348</i>	<i>146,320</i>	<i>0.6%</i>	
Nebraska				
Keya Paha	983	851	-2.0%	1
Rock	1,756	1,515	-2.1%	2
Holt	11,551	10,310	-1.6%	5
Garfield	1,902	1,714	-1.5%	3
Wheeler	886	806	-1.3%	2
Greeley	2,714	2,312	-2.3%	5
Boone	6,259	5,505	-1.8%	9
Nance	4,038	3,554	-1.8%	9
Merrick	8,204	7,665	-1.0%	17
Hamilton	9,403	9,282	-0.2%	17
York	14,598	14,339	-0.3%	25
Fillmore	6,634	6,026	-1.4%	12
Saline	13,843	13,823	0.0%	24
Jefferson	8,340	7,505	-1.5%	14
<i>Subtotal Nebraska</i>	<i>91,111</i>	<i>85,207</i>	<i>-1.0%</i>	
Pump Stations - Kansas				
Clay	8,822	8,691	-0.2%	14
Butler	59484	62879	0.8%	42

**TABLE 3.10.1-4
County Population and Population Density**

County	Population		Annual Average % Change	Density per Sq. Mile
	Population 2000	Population 2007		
<i>Subtotal Kansas</i>	68,306	71,570	0.7%	
Gulf Coast Segment				
Oklahoma				
Atoka	13,879	14,479	0.6%	14
Bryan	36,534	39,298	1.0%	40
Coal	6,031	5,698	-0.8%	12
Creek	67,369	68,940	0.3%	70
Hughes	14,154	13,576	-0.6%	18
Lincoln	32,080	32,211	0.1%	34
Okfuskee	11,814	11,197	-0.8%	19
Payne	68,186	77,724	1.9%	99
Seminole	24,896	24,103	-0.5%	39
Pontotoc	35,143	36,512	0.5%	49
<i>Subtotal Oklahoma</i>	310,086	323,738	0.6%	
Texas				
Angelina	80,130	82,570	0.4%	10
Cherokee	46,663	48,056	0.4%	44
Delta	5,327	5,368	0.1%	19
Fannin	31,242	32,930	0.8%	35
Franklin	9,458	11,104	2.3%	33
Hardin	48,073	51,530	1.0%	54
Hopkins	31,960	33,699	0.8%	41
Jefferson	252,051	242,372	-0.6%	279
Lamar	48,499	49,090	0.2%	53
Liberty	70,159	74,930	0.9%	60
Nacogdoches	59,203	62,221	0.7%	62
Polk	41,139	46,206	1.7%	39
Rusk	47,372	48,452	0.3%	51
Smith	174,706	197,952	1.8%	188
Upshur	35,291	37,881	1.0%	60
Wood	36,752	41,817	1.9%	56
<i>Subtotal Texas (Gulf Coast Segment)</i>	1,018,025	1,066,178	0.7%	
Houston Lateral				
Texas				
Liberty (see the Gulf Coast Segment)				

TABLE 3.10.1-4 County Population and Population Density				
County	Population		Annual Average % Change	Density per Sq. Mile
	Population 2000	Population 2007		
Chambers	26,031	28,740	1.4%	43
Harris	3,400,590	3,912,196	2.0%	1,967
<i>Subtotal Texas (Houston Lateral)</i>	<i>3,426,621</i>	<i>3,940,936</i>	<i>2.0%</i>	
<i>Subtotal Texas</i>	<i>4,444,646</i>	<i>5,007,114</i>	<i>1.7%</i>	
Total Counties	5,080,703	5,657,696	1.5%	

Source: US Census County population, population change and estimated components of population change: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2008 (CO-EST2008-alldata).

Table 3.10.1-5 shows the communities located within a 2-mile proximity of the proposed Project. The total population of these communities is 2.467 million. Of that 2.467 million, 2.208 million are located in Houston. The remaining 259,000 are distributed along the remainder of the proposed Project area. The total community populations by state are; 2,465 located in three communities in Montana, 3,368 located in four communities in South Dakota, 1,520 located in seven communities in Nebraska, 13,251 located in six communities in Kansas 12,210 located in eight communities in Oklahoma and 214,045 in fifteen communities in Texas, excluding Houston. Many of the potentially-affected communities along the northern portions of the route have experienced an average annual reduction in population between 2000 and 2007, particularly in Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska and Kansas. Another indication of the relatively sparsely populated nature of the Project area is the fact that in several counties there are no communities within a 2-mile proximity of the proposed Project, e.g., Phillips, Dawson and Prairie counties in Montana. Likewise in South Dakota, 6 of the 9 counties do not have communities within 2 miles of the Project. In Nebraska there are 8 of 15 counties without communities within 2 miles of the Project. In Oklahoma 3 of 12 and in Texas 7 of 31 counties do not have communities within 2 miles of the Project.

Between 2000 and 2007, the highest average annual growth rate occurred along the Houston Lateral component of the proposed Project, in Mont Belvieu and Houston.

TABLE 3.10.1-5 Population of Communities within 2-mile Proximity of the Project				
County	Communities	Population		Annual Average % Change
		2000	2007	
Steele City Segment				
Montana				
Phillips	NA	NA	NA	NA
Valley	Nashua	325	291	-1.6%
McCone	Circle	644	558	-2.0%
Dawson	NA	NA	NA	NA
Prairie	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fallon	Baker	1,695	1,616	-0.7%
<i>Subtotal Montana</i>		<i>2,664</i>	<i>2,465</i>	<i>-1.1%</i>

**TABLE 3.10.1-5
Population of Communities within 2-mile Proximity of the Project**

County	Communities	Population		Annual Average % Change
		2000	2007	
South Dakota				
Harding	Buffalo	380	330	NA
Butte	NA	NA	NA	NA
Perkins	NA	NA	NA	NA
Meade	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pennington	NA	NA	NA	NA
Haakon	Midland	179	150	-2.5%
Jones	Draper	92	83	-1.5%
Lyman	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tripp	Winner	3,137	2,805	-1.6%
<i>Subtotal South Dakota</i>		3,788	3,368	-1.7%
Nebraska				
Keya Paha	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rock	NA	NA	NA	NA
Holt	NA	NA	NA	NA
Garfield	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wheeler	Ericson	104	95	-1.3%
Greeley	NA	NA	NA	NA
Boone	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nance	NA	NA	NA	NA
Merrick	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hamilton	Hordville	150	144	-0.6%
York	McCool Junction	385	NA	NA
Fillmore	Exeter	712	647	-1.4%
Fillmore	Milligan	315	284	-1.5%
Saline	Western	287	274	-0.7%
Jefferson	Steele City	84	76	-1.4%
<i>Subtotal Nebraska</i>		2,037	1,520	-4.1%
Pump Stations				
Kansas				
Clay	Wakefield	838	854	0.3%
Clay	Green	147	137	-1.0%
Butler	Towanda	1,338	1,354	0.2%
Butler	Potwin	457	433	-0.8%
Butler	Douglass	1,813	1,790	-0.2%
Butler	Augusta	8423	8683	0.4%

**TABLE 3.10.1-5
Population of Communities within 2-mile Proximity of the Project**

County	Communities	Population		Annual Average % Change
		2000	2007	
<i>Subtotal Kansas</i>		13,016	13,251	0.3%
Gulf Coast Segment				
Oklahoma				
Atoka	Atoka	2,988	3,069	0.4%
Atoka	Tushka	345	366	0.8%
Atoka	Caney	199	210	0.8%
Bryan	NA	NA	NA	NA
Coal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Creek	Stroud	2,758	2,742	-0.1%
Hughes	Allen	2,398	NA	NA
Lincoln	NA	NA	NA	NA
Okfuskee	Paden	446	422	-0.8%
Okfuskee	Boley	1126	1091	-0.5%
Payne	NA	NA	NA	NA
Seminole	Wewoka	3,562	3,326	-1.0%
Pontotoc (?)		35,143	36,512	0.5%
<i>Subtotal Oklahoma</i>		14,773	12,210	-2.7%
Texas				
Angelina	Hudson	3,792	4,231	1.6%
Angelina	Diboll	5,470	5,541	0.2%
Cherokee	Wells	769	792	0.4%
Delta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fannin	NA	NA	NA	NA
Franklin/Wood	Winnsboro	3,584	3,909	1.2%
Hardin	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hopkins	Tira	248	258	0.6%
Jefferson	Beaumont	113,866	109,579	-0.5%
Jefferson	Port Arthur	57,755	55,313	-0.6%
Jefferson	Central Gardens	4,106	NA	NA
Jefferson	Nederland	17,422	16,178	-1.1%
Jefferson	China	1,112	1,042	-0.9%
Jefferson	Port Neches	13,301	12,681	-0.7%
Lamar	NA	NA	NA	NA
Liberty	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nacogdoches	NA	NA	NA	NA
Polk	Corrigan	1,721	1,887	1.3%

TABLE 3.10.1-5 Population of Communities within 2-mile Proximity of the Project				
County	Communities	Population		Annual Average % Change
		2000	2007	
Rusk	Reklaw	327	336	0.4%
Smith	Arp	901	952	0.8%
Upshur	Big Sandy	1,288	1,346	0.6%
Wood	See Franklin	NA	NA	NA
<i>Subtotal Texas (Gulf Coast Segment)</i>		<i>225,662</i>	<i>214,045</i>	<i>-0.8%</i>
Houston Lateral				
Texas				
Liberty	Hardin	755	792	0.7%
Chambers	Liberty	8,033	8,033	0.0%
Chambers	Mont Belvieu	2,324	2,637	1.8%
Harris	Ames	1,079	1,138	0.8%
Harris	Barrett	2,872	NA	NA
Harris	Highlands	7,089	NA	NA
Harris	Channelview	29,685	NA	NA
Harris	Sheldon	1,831	NA	NA
Harris	Houston	1,953,631	2,208,180	1.8%
<i>Subtotal Texas (Houston Lateral)</i>		<i>2,007,299</i>	<i>2,220,780</i>	<i>1.5%</i>
<i>Subtotal Texas</i>		<i>2,232,961</i>	<i>2,434,825</i>	<i>1.2%</i>
Total All Communities		2,269,239	2,467,639	1.2%

Population, Population change and estimated components of population change: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2008 (NST-EST2008-alldata).

3.10.1.3 Housing

Available housing to serve the Project is a function of the housing stock (mainly rental and short-term accommodations), recent economic and population growth, and demand for housing from other sources. Tables 3.10.1-6 and 3.10.1-7 show the existing housing units in the Project area and the existing short-term housing resources, such as rentals and hotel and motel rooms.

The total number of housing units in the counties that would be crossed by the Project was estimated at over 2,187,827 in 2007, with 1,557,935 (71.2 percent) of those units in the Houston lateral (Table 3.10.1-6). The fewest number of units are found in Montana, Kansas and Nebraska with 14,622 units, 29,850 units and 41,082 units, respectively. Most of the existing housing stock is occupied single-family residences that would not be available for use by Project workers.

**TABLE 3.10.1-6
Housing Units for Counties along the Project**

County	Total Housing Units		Percent of Total	Building Permits
	Housing Units 2000	Housing Units 2007		
Steele City Segment				
Montana				
Phillips	2,502	2,484		0
Valley	4,847	4,807		1
McCone	1,087	1,076		0
Dawson	4,168	4,135		3
Prairie	718	711		0
Fallon	1,410	1,409		0
<i>Subtotal Montana</i>	<i>14,732</i>	<i>14,622</i>	<i>0.7%</i>	<i>4</i>
South Dakota				
Harding	804	804		0
Butte	4,059	4,384		91
Perkins	1,854	1,897		5
Meade	10,149	11,523		118
Pennington	37,249	42,208		838
Haakon	1,002	1,036		3
Jones	614	627		5
Lyman	1,636	1,690		6
Tripp	3,036	3,098		0
<i>Subtotal South Dakota</i>	<i>60,403</i>	<i>67,267</i>	<i>3.1%</i>	<i>1,066</i>
Nebraska				
Keya Paha	548	572		3
Rock	935	947		3
Holt	5,281	5,425		8
Garfield	1,021	1,028		2
Wheeler	561	573		0
Greeley	1,199	1,221		0
Boone	2,733	2,787		11
Nance	1,787	1,771		7
Merrick	3,649	3,770		30
Hamilton	3,850	3,980		28
York	6,172	6,240		22
Fillmore	2,990	2,989		6
Saline	5,611	5,788		62
Jefferson	3,942	3,991		21
<i>Subtotal Nebraska</i>	<i>40,279</i>	<i>41,082</i>	<i>1.9%</i>	<i>203</i>

**TABLE 3.10.1-6
Housing Units for Counties along the Project**

County	Total Housing Units		Percent of Total	Building Permits
	Housing Units 2000	Housing Units 2007		
Pump Stations - Kansas				
Clay	4,084	4,200		20
Butler	23,176	25,650		408
<i>Subtotal Kansas</i>	<i>27,260</i>	<i>29,850</i>	<i>1.4%</i>	<i>428</i>
Gulf Coast Segment				
Oklahoma				
Payne	29,326	32,906		167
Lincoln	13,712	14,241		24
Creek	27,986	29,603		228
Okfuskee	5,114	5,314		5
Seminole	11,146	11,537		21
Hughes	6,237	6,368		4
Coal	2,744	2,821		1
Atoka	5,673	5,868		7
Bryan	16,715	17,998		415
<i>Subtotal Oklahoma</i>	<i>118,653</i>	<i>126,656</i>	<i>5.8%</i>	<i>872</i>
Texas				
Fannin	12,887	13,568		44
Lamar	21,113	22,130		81
Delta	2,410	2,489		11
Hopkins	14,020	14,651		14
Franklin	5,132	5,410		4
Wood	17,939	18,607		14
Upshur	14,930	15,593		67
Smith	71,701	77,281		679
Cherokee	19,173	19,965		33
Rusk	19,867	20,598		8
Nacogdoches	25,051	26,720		256
Angelina	32,435	34,125		185
Polk	21,177	22,636		460
Liberty	26,359	28,294		293
Hardin	19,836	20,966		129
Jefferson	102,080	104,499		1,576
<i>Subtotal Texas -Gulf Coast</i>	<i>426,110</i>	<i>447,532</i>	<i>20.5%</i>	<i>3,854</i>
Houston Lateral				
Texas				

TABLE 3.10.1-6 Housing Units for Counties along the Project				
County	Total Housing Units		Percent of Total	Building Permits
	Housing Units 2000	Housing Units 2007		
Chambers	10,336	13,351		368
Harris	1,298,130	1,544,584		46,455
<i>Subtotal Texas – Houston Lateral</i>	<i>1,308,466</i>	<i>1,557,935</i>	<i>71.2%</i>	<i>46,823</i>
<i>Subtotal Texas</i>	<i>1,734,576</i>	<i>2,005,467</i>	<i>91.7%</i>	<i>50,677</i>
Total All Communities		1,908,240	2,187,827	100.0%

¹ States and counties are listed geographically from north to south as proposed Project crosses area.

² Housing in counties on the Cushing Extension were analyzed as part of the Keystone Pipeline Project and are included for clarity only. Construction in these counties would be related to pump stations only except in Jefferson County, NE, and Payne County, OK, where some new pipeline construction would occur.

NA = Data not available.

Source: Census 2000.

More pertinent to the analysis is the number of rental units and short-term accommodations, such as motel and hotel rooms and recreational vehicle (RV) sites, and related vacancy rates (Table 3.10.1-7). The total number of rental units located across all affected counties was about 757,191 in 2000, of which 592,018 (78.2 percent) were located in Chambers and Harris counties in Texas. Montana, Kansas and Nebraska had the fewest rental units. Rental vacancy rates and available rental housing varied considerably across states and counties. The highest vacancy rates for rental units were in Montana, ranging from 7.9 percent to 25.8 percent in the affected counties, compared with the lowest weighted average of 8.3 percent in Nebraska. Based on these data, approximately 68,051 vacant rental units are available in the region of influence, of which 49,451 occur in the counties along the Houston Lateral. At the county level, the number of available units is smallest in Wheeler County, Nebraska at nine units.¹ Of the 57 counties in the Project area, 12 had less than 50 available units. Most of those counties are located in Montana and South Dakota.

Within the spectrum of currently available housing, alternatives to rental housing are temporary short-term accommodations in hotels/motels rooms, and RV sites. In some cases, recreational cabins and seasonal housing for migratory workers also may be available. Short-term accommodations are more flexible and likely would be the preferred form of housing for construction workers. It is estimated that approximately 23,855 hotel/motel rooms are located within a 50-mile corridor of the pipeline route. Of that number more than half are located in the two-county Houston Lateral portion of the Project. The fewest hotels/motel rooms are in Kansas (356) and Montana (761). The total number of hotels/motel rooms and RV sites by county are presented in Table 3.10.1-7. The availability of short-term accommodations varies throughout the year and depends on a number of factors, including seasonal fluctuations and timing of local events.

¹ Available units are calculated by multiplying the rental units by the vacancy rate.

**TABLE 3.10.1-7
Short-term Housing Assessment for Counties along the Project**

County	Rentals (2000)			Hotel/ Motel		RV Sites
	Units	Vacancy Rate	Per cent of Total	Available Units (Calculated)	Rooms	
Steele City Segment						
Montana						
Phillips	632	14.1		89	126	40
Valley	826	7.9		65	253	44
McCone	240	25.8		62	14	0
Dawson	1,076	12.5		135	277	94
Prairie	143	15.4		22	0	9
Fallon	333	22.5		75	91	18
<i>Subtotal Montana</i>	<i>3,250</i>	<i>13.8</i>	<i>0.4%</i>	<i>448</i>	<i>761</i>	<i>3.2%</i>
South Dakota						
Harding	152	8.6		13	20	0
Butte	1,119	15.9		178	222	93
Perkins	396	15.4		61	90	0
Meade	3,105	9.9		307	398	465
Pennington	12,516	6.4		801	4,045	1,895
Haakon	233	13.3		31	29	21
Jones	159	11.9		19	189	200
Lyman	477	10.1		48	390	166
Tripp	736	12.4		91	194	20
<i>Subtotal South Dakota</i>	<i>18,893</i>	<i>8.2</i>	<i>2.5%</i>	<i>1,550</i>	<i>5,577</i>	<i>23.4%</i>
Nebraska						
Keya Paha	124	8.1		10	0	20
Rock	216	4.6		10	36	0
Holt	1,376	11.6		160	198	19
Garfield	257	13.2		34	28	25
Wheeler	117	7.7		9	0	0
Greeley	244	5.3		13	0	0
Boone	676	9.8		66	34	0
Nance	440	9.3		41	16	0
Merrick	896	7.4		66	33	0
Hamilton	956	8.8		84	10	45
York	1,905	8.3		158	575	4
Fillmore	742	7.5		56	26	0
Saline	1,598	4.8		77	77	48

**TABLE 3.10.1-7
Short-term Housing Assessment for Counties along the Project**

County	Rentals (2000)			Hotel/ Motel		RV Sites
	Units	Vacancy Rate	Per cent of Total	Available Units (Calculated)	Rooms	
Jefferson	932	9.4		88	45	0
<i>Subtotal Nebraska</i>	<i>10,479</i>	<i>8.3</i>	<i>1.4%</i>	<i>871</i>	<i>1,078</i>	<i>4.5%</i>
Pump Stations - Kansas						
Clay	973	13.6		132	55	0
Butler	5,327	9.8		522	301	36
<i>Subtotal Kansas</i>	<i>6,300</i>	<i>10.4</i>	<i>0.8%</i>	<i>654</i>	<i>356</i>	<i>36</i>
Gulf Coast Segment						
Oklahoma						
Payne	12,680	7.3		926	650	0
Lincoln	2,738	10.9		298	145	29
Creek	6,182	10.1		624	142	0
Okfuskee	1,138	10.6		121	47	0
Seminole	2,991	12		359	141	0
Hughes	1,403	8.2		115	13	0
Coal	653	9.6		63	27	0
Atoka	1,354	12.9		175	54	0
Bryan	4,887	9.7		474	203	159
<i>Subtotal Oklahoma</i>	<i>34,026</i>	<i>9.3</i>	<i>4.5%</i>	<i>3,154</i>	<i>1,422</i>	<i>188</i>
Texas						
Fannin	3,167	11.5		364	53	0
Lamar	6,902	9.4		649	621	0
Delta	506	5.9		30	0	0
Hopkins	4,034	12.7		512	466	0
Franklin	907	13		118	44	0
Wood	3,003	9.7		291	61	0
Upshur	2,745	11.7		321	74	0
Smith	22,065	9.8		2,162	1,937	180
Cherokee	4,895	10		490	222	0
Rusk	3,891	10.3		401	240	0
Nacogdoches	9,334	9.4		877	106	24
Angelina	8,810	10.1		890	920	0
Polk	3,212	13.9		446	281	215
Liberty	5,405	9.6		519	168	0
Hardin	3,545	12.9		457	108	0

TABLE 3.10.1-7 Short-term Housing Assessment for Counties along the Project							
County	Rentals (2000)			Hotel/ Motel		RV Sites	
	Units	Vacancy Rate	Per cent of Total	Available Units (Calculated)	Rooms		Percent of Total
Jefferson	34,997	9.7		3,395	2,911		144
<i>Subtotal Texas</i>	<i>117,418</i>	<i>10.2</i>	<i>15.5%</i>	<i>11,923</i>	<i>8,212</i>	<i>34.4%</i>	<i>563</i>
Houston Lateral							
Texas							
Chambers	1,804	17		307	202		110
Harris	590,214	8.7		51,349	12,180		501
<i>Texas – Houston</i>	<i>592,018</i>	<i>8.7</i>	<i>78.2%</i>	<i>51,655</i>	<i>12,382</i>	<i>51.9%</i>	<i>611</i>
<i>Lateral Total</i>							
<i>Subtotal Texas</i>	<i>709,436</i>	<i>8.9</i>	<i>93.7%</i>	<i>63,140</i>	<i>20,594</i>	<i>86.3%</i>	<i>1,174</i>
Total All Communities	757,191	9.3	100.0%	68,051	23,855	100.0%	1,728

¹ States and counties are listed geographically from north to south as proposed Project crosses area.

² Housing in counties on the Cushing Extension were analyzed as part of the Keystone Pipeline Project and are included for clarity only. Construction in these counties would be related to pump stations only except in Jefferson County, NE, and Payne County, OK, where some new pipeline construction would occur.

NA = Data not available.

Sources: Keystone 2009 from primary data sources: Rentals: Census 2000, RV sites: using Delorme Gazetteers; Total hotel and motel rooms: were found using www.travelpost.com/hotels.aspx, www.aacolorado.com/travel/, www.tripadvisor.com/

3.10.1.4 Economic Activity

Employment and income patterns provide insight into local economic conditions, including the strength of the local economy and the well-being of its residents. Summary statistics covering these economic parameters are shown in Table 3.10.1-8. The most recent per capita income, median household income, unemployment rates, and work force statistics for each county are shown in Table 3.10.1-8 along with one historical data point. For reference, data are included for each state and the U.S. In every state on the Project route, both the 2007 per capita income and the 2007 median household income were less than the U.S. levels. In nearly every county the 2007 per capita income and median household income were less than the respective state levels. Despite the relatively lower level of income the most recent unemployment rate (June 2009) in each state is lower than the U.S. level for the same time period. The county unemployment rates are generally less than the respective state unemployment rates, except in Oklahoma and Texas. Each statistic is discussed below in more detail.

The state with the lowest 2007 per capita income is Montana, at \$33,225, or \$5,390 less than the national average. The state with the highest 2007 per capita income is Texas, at \$37,083, or \$1,532 less than the national average. The county with the lowest per capita income in 2007 was Keya Paha, Nebraska at \$21,254, or \$15,118 less than per capita income for Nebraska. The county with the highest per capita income is Harris, Texas (where Houston is located) at \$49,634, or \$12,551 larger than the state level. The range of county-level per capita income (\$21,254 to \$49,634) shows the diversity of economic conditions along the Project corridor.

The state with the lowest 2007 median household income is Oklahoma at \$41,551, or \$9,189 less than the national level. The state with the highest 2007 median household income is Texas at \$47,563, or \$3,177 less than the national average. The county with the lowest median household income in 2007 was Hughes, Oklahoma at \$28,689, or \$12,862 less than Oklahoma's median household income. The county with the lowest median income relative to the state level is Keya Paha, Nebraska, with a difference of \$16,067 from the state level. Chambers County, Texas had the highest median household income at \$62,164, or \$14,601 higher than Texas. This range of county-level median household income (\$28,689 to \$62,124) also demonstrates the diversity of economic conditions along the Project corridor.

The state with the highest unemployment rate in June 2009 is Texas, at 7.5 percent or 2.2 percent lower than the national level of 9.7 percent. The state with the lowest unemployment rate in June 2009 is Nebraska at 5.0 percent, or 4.7 percent less than the national average. The county with the highest unemployment rate is Hughes, Oklahoma at 11.7 percent, or 5.4 percent higher than the state level. The lowest unemployment rate is in Garfield County, Nebraska at 2.7 percent, or 2.3 percent less than the state average. The relatively lower unemployment rates along most of the Project corridor shows the diversity of economic conditions and the dependence on agriculture in many of the counties, as the unemployment statistic is for non-farm payroll employment.

The number of individuals in the work force by county ranges from a low of 384, in Keya Paha, Nebraska to a high of 1,945,022 in Harris, Texas. The work force numbers represent all individual either employed or unemployed and looking for employment.

TABLE 3.10.1-8 Per Capita Income, Median Household Income and Unemployment Rates by County (nominal dollars)											
Per Capita Income ^(a)			Median Household Income ^(b)			Unemployment Rate ^(c)			Labor Force		
2007	1999	2007 higher (+) lower (-) than State ^(d)	2007	2004	2007 higher (+) lower (-) than State ^(d)	Jun-09	2008	2002	June '09 higher (+) lower (-) than State ^(d)	2008 ^(e)	
Steele City Segment											
Montana											
Phillips	\$26,876	\$17,288	-6,349	\$33,798	\$31,742	-9,202	4.40%	4.50%	4.50%	-2.00%	2,179
Valley	\$31,556	\$23,247	-1,669	\$37,019	\$34,514	-5,981	4.40%	3.80%	4.10%	-2.00%	3,649
McCone	\$24,857	\$20,499	-8,368	\$38,535	\$29,746	-4,465	3.00%	2.60%	2.70%	-3.40%	1,015
Dawson	\$29,268	\$20,307	-3,957	\$43,678	\$35,740	678	4.10%	3.30%	3.40%	-2.30%	4,386
Prairie	\$28,874	\$21,524	-4,351	\$32,857	\$31,221	-10,143	3.30%	3.80%	5.10%	-3.10%	578
Fallon	\$35,405	\$20,281	2,180	\$42,408	\$37,822	-592	3.00%	2.30%	3.30%	-3.40%	1,824
<i>State of Montana</i>	\$33,225	\$21,585	-5,390	\$43,000	\$35,574	-7,740	6.40%	4.50%	4.50%	-3.30%	506,162
South Dakota											
Harding	\$26,439	\$17,807	-9,321	\$34,729	\$32,895	-8,778	4.10%	2.80%	2.50%	-1.00%	762
Butte	\$29,497	\$18,341	-6,263	\$38,513	\$33,286	-4,994	5.70%	2.70%	3.20%	0.60%	5,411
Perkins	\$28,636	\$22,162	-7,124	\$34,085	\$30,730	-9,422	4.60%	3.10%	3.20%	-0.50%	1,603
Meade	\$35,599	\$22,237	-161	\$46,063	\$44,516	2,556	4.80%	3.00%	3.00%	-0.30%	12,579
Pennington	\$36,425	\$25,099	665	\$44,296	\$40,624	789	4.80%	2.90%	3.10%	-0.30%	54,828
Haakon	\$42,511	\$28,797	6,751	\$40,461	\$33,470	-3,046	3.50%	2.60%	2.30%	-1.60%	1,154
Jones	\$31,324	\$26,213	-4,436	\$36,106	\$31,281	-7,401	3.20%	2.40%	2.00%	-1.90%	694
Lyman	\$26,024	\$21,419	-9,736	\$32,330	\$30,035	-11,177	6.20%	4.80%	4.50%	1.10%	1,968
Tripp	\$30,384	\$21,180	-5,376	\$35,631	\$32,606	-7,876	3.80%	3.00%	4.10%	-1.30%	2,935
<i>State of South Dakota</i>	\$35,760	\$24,475	-2,855	\$43,507	\$39,265	-7,233	5.10%	3.00%	3.30%	-4.60%	444,892
Nebraska											
Keya Paha	\$21,254	\$13,813	-15,118	\$31,005	\$32,279	-16,067	4.40%	4.70%	3.80%	-0.60%	384

Rock	\$23,001	\$19,493	-13,371	\$32,257	\$27,512	-14,815	3.10%	2.90%	2.80%	-1.90%	839
Holt	\$31,910	\$21,025	-4,462	\$37,354	\$35,139	-9,718	3.00%	2.70%	3.00%	-2.00%	6,092
Garfield	\$28,712	\$22,361	-7,660	\$32,967	\$30,568	-14,105	2.70%	2.60%	2.90%	-2.30%	1,051
Wheeler	\$26,742	\$21,715	-9,630	\$34,173	\$33,834	-12,899	4.30%	2.50%	2.20%	-0.70%	435
Greeley	\$29,263	\$19,654	-7,109	\$34,812	\$32,241	-12,260	3.80%	3.00%	3.60%	-1.20%	1,298
Boone	\$30,930	\$21,047	-5,442	\$37,466	\$35,655	-9,606	3.30%	2.70%	3.10%	-1.70%	3,214
Nance	\$31,190	\$20,466	-5,182	\$38,372	\$35,011	-8,700	3.30%	3.00%	4.50%	-1.70%	2,057
Merrick	\$29,338	\$21,476	-7,034	\$41,711	\$38,222	-5,361	3.90%	3.00%	3.80%	-1.10%	4,296
Hamilton	\$30,294	\$22,302	-6,078	\$49,655	\$45,934	2,583	3.00%	6.40%	3.00%	-2.00%	5,895
York	\$32,536	\$24,966	-3,836	\$48,369	\$41,098	1,297	4.10%	3.70%	3.00%	-0.90%	7,115
Fillmore	\$33,949	\$25,850	-2,423	\$41,162	\$38,911	-5,910	3.50%	3.00%	3.50%	-1.50%	3,195
Saline	\$30,142	\$21,541	-6,230	\$45,645	\$41,876	-1,427	4.10%	3.40%	3.00%	-0.90%	8,533
Jefferson	\$32,691	\$22,183	-3,681	\$39,914	\$37,559	-7,158	4.80%	3.90%	4.60%	-0.20%	4,394
<i>State of Nebraska</i>	\$36,372	\$26,465	-2,243	\$47,072	\$42,166	-3,668	5.00%	3.30%	3.70%	-4.70%	995,642
Kansas											
Clay	\$34,076	\$23,697	-2,449	\$42,035	\$37,306	-5,306	4.20%	3.30%	4.30%	-2.80%	5,077
Butler	\$34,739	\$25,351	-1,786	\$56,372	\$49,599	9,031	7.20%	4.10%	5.70%	0.20%	33,094
<i>State of Kansas</i>	\$36,525	\$26,195	-2,090	\$47,341	\$41,664	-3,399	7.00%	4.40%	5.10%	-2.70%	1,496,954
Gulf Coast Segment											
Oklahoma											
Payne	\$27,050	\$19,244	-7,947	\$33,840	\$31,259	-7,711	6.30%	4.00%	3.50%	0.00%	35,805
Lincoln	\$26,316	\$18,280	-8,681	\$38,204	\$33,820	-3,347	7.00%	4.00%	5.00%	0.70%	14,061
Creek	\$27,585	\$19,779	-7,412	\$41,745	\$36,134	194	7.80%	4.40%	5.50%	1.50%	30,948
Okfuskee	\$22,415	\$14,343	-12,582	\$29,516	\$26,340	-12,035	8.80%	4.20%	5.80%	2.50%	4,614
Seminole	\$26,460	\$15,974	-8,537	\$33,207	\$27,124	-8,344	9.60%	4.60%	7.00%	3.30%	11,069
Hughes	\$22,449	\$14,774	-12,548	\$28,689	\$25,324	-12,862	11.70%	5.60%	7.30%	5.40%	5,046
Coal	\$21,426	\$14,230	-13,571	\$30,241	\$25,525	-11,310	9.60%	5.00%	6.60%	3.30%	2,496

Atoka	\$21,348	\$14,713	-13,649	\$29,810	\$27,211	-11,741	8.60%	4.70%	5.10%	2.30%	6,061
Bryan	\$27,361	\$18,106	-7,636	\$33,584	\$29,055	-7,967	5.00%	3.40%	3.90%	-1.30%	20,712
<i>State of Oklahoma</i>	\$34,997	\$22,567	-3,618	\$41,551	\$37,109	-9,189	6.30%	3.80%	4.80%	-3.40%	1,748,421
Texas											
Fannin	\$25,258	\$19,465	-11,825	\$40,840	\$35,434	-6,723	7.80%	5.90%	7.80%	0.30%	13,657
Lamar	\$27,500	\$21,730	-9,583	\$38,110	\$32,581	-9,453	6.70%	5.50%	6.90%	-0.80%	23,811
Delta	\$25,066	\$18,721	-12,017	\$34,975	\$31,122	-12,588	7.30%	5.30%	6.30%	-0.20%	2,340
Hopkins	\$27,843	\$22,168	-9,240	\$39,105	\$33,267	-8,458	5.40%	4.20%	5.40%	-2.10%	17,482
Franklin	\$28,517	\$22,126	-8,566	\$40,152	\$35,830	-7,411	5.90%	4.30%	4.80%	-1.60%	5,387
Wood	\$26,537	\$19,143	-10,546	\$40,592	\$34,843	-6,971	7.10%	5.10%	6.40%	-0.40%	18,250
Upshur	\$28,164	\$19,918	-8,919	\$40,616	\$34,690	-6,947	7.30%	4.30%	6.40%	-0.20%	19,709
Smith	\$34,713	\$25,543	-2,370	\$44,699	\$39,665	-2,864	7.00%	5.00%	5.60%	-0.50%	98,942
Cherokee	\$27,439	\$21,562	-9,644	\$35,413	\$30,223	-12,150	8.50%	6.00%	5.80%	1.00%	20,374
Rusk	\$28,081	\$19,140	-9,002	\$41,906	\$35,343	-5,657	6.80%	4.40%	6.60%	-0.70%	24,081
Nacogdoches	\$24,491	\$19,056	-12,592	\$32,774	\$29,952	-14,789	5.60%	4.40%	5.50%	-1.90%	30,614
Angelina	\$32,627	\$20,944	-4,456	\$37,953	\$35,749	-9,610	8.10%	4.90%	6.60%	0.60%	38,987
Polk	\$31,832	\$22,873	-5,251	\$37,152	\$36,368	-10,411	8.30%	6.40%	7.80%	0.80%	16,653
Liberty	\$30,638	\$19,958	-6,445	\$46,159	\$39,120	-1,404	9.30%	6.00%	8.20%	1.80%	31,455
Hardin	\$32,380	\$21,307	-4,703	\$52,798	\$41,677	5,235	8.70%	5.50%	7.30%	1.20%	25,947
Jefferson	\$33,795	\$22,894	-3,288	\$39,499	\$35,110	-8,064	9.00%	6.80%	7.80%	1.50%	113,734
<i>State of Texas</i>	\$37,083	\$26,250	-1,532	\$47,563	\$41,645	-3,177	7.50%	4.90%	6.40%	-2.20%	11,701,608
Houston Lateral											
Texas											
Chambers	\$38,856	\$25,883	1,773	\$62,164	\$54,474	14,601	8.60%	5.80%	5.20%	1.10%	14,254
Harris	\$49,634	\$32,633	12,551	\$49,977	\$41,922	2,414	6.90%	4.80%	6.10%	-0.60%	1,945,022
<i>State of Texas</i>	\$37,083	\$26,250	-1,532	\$47,563	\$41,645	-3,177	7.50%	4.90%	6.40%	-2.20%	11,701,608
U.S.	\$38,615	\$27,939	NA	\$50,740	\$44,334	NA	9.70%	5.80%	5.80%	0.00%	NA

¹ States and counties are listed geographically from north to south as proposed Project crosses area.

² Housing in counties on the Cushing Extension were analyzed as part of the Keystone Pipeline Project and are included for clarity only. Construction in these counties would be related to pump stations only except in Jefferson County, NE, and Payne County, OK, where some new pipeline construction would occur.

Notes:

(a) U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic Accounts, Local Area Personal Income, Table CA1-3: Per capita personal income, <http://bea.gov/regional/reis/>.

(b) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income & Poverty Estimates, State and County Interactive Table,

<http://www.census.gov/did/www/saipe/data/statecounty/index.html>.

(c) U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics, <http://www.bls.gov/lau/#tables>.

(d) For each state the difference is reported as the difference between US and state

(e) Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics, County Data. <http://www.bls.gov/lau/#tables>

3.10.1.5 Tax Revenue

The Project would generate varied tax revenues for local and state jurisdictions, as well as the federal government. The major incremental tax revenue at the state and local levels would be property taxes, which are based on the assessed value of Project facilities and applicable tax rates. Generally, states assess the value of pipelines in order to facilitate consistent valuation among counties crossed within the state. Table 3.10.1-9 displays the 2007 property tax levied by county, the assessed value of property and the implied effective tax rate by county for the Project area of influence.

Effective property tax rates in the area of influence range from a low of 1.05 percent of property value in Harding County, South Dakota to a high of 2.73 percent in Jefferson County, Texas. In general the property tax rates are between 1.0 and 3.0 percent, with an average of 2.09 percent. The property tax rates in Texas are relatively higher than the other counties within the area of influence, averaging above 2.0 percent.

Other fiscal revenues that may be generated by the proposed Project include sales and use taxes, which are based on the value of goods and materials purchased for the Project and by construction workers, as well as income taxes levied on labor earnings. In some states, there may be corporation taxes at both a state and local level as well. In addition, federal agencies assess fees for use of public lands for activities such as pipeline ROWs and electrical transmission line or electrical distribution line ROWs. Applicable sales and income tax rates vary across counties.

TABLE 3.10.1-9 2007 Tax Levy and Assessed Valuation by County			
Project Component - State/ County	Taxes Levied (\$)	Assessed Value (\$)	Effective Tax Rate (%)
Steele City Segment			
Montana			
Phillips	5,365,348	321,173,215	1.67%
Valley	10,664,457	485,988,933	2.19%
McCone	3,164,719	191,888,122	1.65%
Dawson	9,655,689	389,463,999	2.48%
Prairie	1,653,199	94,403,567	1.75%
Fallon	4,841,377	334,310,467	1.45%
<i>Subtotal Montana</i>	<i>35,344,789</i>	<i>1,817,228,303</i>	<i>1.94%</i>
South Dakota			
Harding	2,226,716	212,834,056	1.05%
Butte	(a)	431,961,877	(a)
Perkins	3,264,315	242,943,061	1.34%
Meade	21,100,792	1,283,587,876	1.64%
Pennington	95,055,282	5,844,272,499	1.63%
Haakon	(a)	238,038,114	(a)
Jones	1,698,003	159,781,297	1.06%
Lyman	4,006,951	366,472,296	1.09%
Tripp	6,353,944	477,303,334	1.33%

**TABLE 3.10.1-9
2007 Tax Levy and Assessed Valuation by County**

Project Component - State/ County	Taxes Levied (\$)	Assessed Value (\$)	Effective Tax Rate (%)
<i>Subtotal South Dakota</i>	133,706,003	9,257,194,410	1.44%
Nebraska			
Keya Paha	2,973,340	197,869,109	1.50%
Rock	4,312,550	252,048,909	1.71%
Holt	20,636,815	1,207,224,347	1.71%
Garfield	2,820,969	167,106,798	1.69%
Wheeler	2,759,762	211,131,099	1.31%
Greeley	5,476,377	316,644,025	1.73%
Boone	11,719,719	692,307,733	1.69%
Nance	6,523,215	351,882,579	1.85%
Merrick	12,719,873	677,474,809	1.88%
Hamilton	18,045,995	1,087,894,709	1.66%
York	23,513,215	1,323,917,546	1.78%
Fillmore	13,731,263	753,036,314	1.82%
Saline	20,727,020	1,058,221,220	1.96%
Jefferson	13,245,717	717,959,001	1.84%
<i>Subtotal Nebraska</i>	159,205,830	9,014,718,198	1.77%
Pump Stations - Kansas			
Clay	9,547,982	706,839,030	1.35%
Butler	79,382,164	5,849,633,370	1.36%
<i>Subtotal Kansas</i>	88,930,146	6,556,472,400	1.36%
Gulf Coast Segment			
Oklahoma			
Atoka	2,498,917	30,238,520	8.26%
Bryan	11,413,199	136,416,335	8.37%
Coal	958,960	11,798,330	8.13%
Creek	22,517,818	225,072,546	10.00%
Hughes	2,522,911	33,385,804	7.56%
Lincoln	7,058,488	78,055,230	9.04%
Okfuskee	1,959,761	23,543,168	8.32%
Payne	28,349,366	293,459,900	9.66%
Seminole	4,357,597	48,614,451	8.96%
Pontotoc	7,918,904	98,800,803	8.02%
<i>Subtotal Oklahoma</i>	89,555,921	979,385,087	9.14%
Texas			
Angelina	60,969,218	3,052,256,882	2.00%
Cherokee	34,338,336	1,812,810,085	1.89%

**TABLE 3.10.1-9
2007 Tax Levy and Assessed Valuation by County**

Project Component - State/ County	Taxes Levied (\$)	Assessed Value (\$)	Effective Tax Rate (%)
Delta	4,534,214	310,482,390	1.46%
Fannin	22,818,196	1,219,567,614	1.87%
Franklin	12,764,553	1,201,312,450	1.06%
Hardin	\$45,760,882	2,061,986,220	2.22%
Hopkins	29,938,733	1,471,649,558	2.03%
Jefferson	506,643,329	18,574,203,161	2.73%
Lamar	47,442,151	2,229,909,021	2.13%
Liberty	81,305,222	4,153,229,220	1.96%
Nacogdoches	52,297,618	2,837,250,144	1.84%
Polk	36,050,016	2,111,521,453	1.71%
Rusk	67,211,423	4,444,332,830	1.51%
Smith	212,734,763	12,541,361,198	1.70%
Upshur	33,340,080	1,911,716,646	1.74%
Wood	41,862,352	2,910,033,737	1.44%
<i>Subtotal Texas (Gulf coast Segment)</i>	<i>1,290,011,086</i>	<i>62,843,622,609</i>	<i>2.05%</i>
Houston Lateral			
Texas			
Liberty	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>	<i>see above</i>
Chambers	126,062,105	6,078,153,460	2.07%
Harris	6,333,806,178	304,029,290,532	2.08%
<i>Subtotal Texas (Houston Lateral)</i>	<i>6,459,868,283</i>	<i>310,107,443,992</i>	<i>2.08%</i>
<i>Subtotal Texas</i>	<i>7,749,879,369</i>	<i>372,951,066,601</i>	<i>2.08%</i>
Total Counties	8,248,703,154	400,477,264,196	2.06%

Sources: South Dakota, Equalized Valuations and Property Taxes Collected from All Sources,
<http://www.state.sd.us/drr2/prospectax/property/publications.htm>

Nebraska Dept of Revenue Property Assessment Division 2007 and 2008 Comparison, December 2008.
<http://pat.ne.gov/researchReports/map/index.html>

Oklahoma, Personal communication with Teresa Strawther, Ad Valorem Division, Oklahoma Tax Commission, July 27, 2009

Kansas <http://www.ksrevenue.org/pdf/forms/08arcomplete.pdf>

Texas taxes by County <http://www.window.state.tx.us/taxinfo/proptax/07taxrates/>. Includes County, School and Special District Taxes on the County Valuation.

Note: (a) County did not report.

3.10.1.6 Public Services

The region of influence is served by a range of public services and service providers. Public services most pertinent to the proposed Project include police and fire protection and medical facilities.² Table 3.10.1-10 shows selected information for relevant public services in the region of influence. Generally, the extent of public service resources in a region is a function of its size, population, and number of established communities. Accordingly, public service infrastructure is typically not as developed in remote rural areas as in urban areas.

There are multiple law enforcement service providers in the region of influence, including state patrols, county sheriff departments, local police departments, and special law enforcement agencies such as university police. In many cases, mutual aid or cooperative agreements allow one agency to provide support to other agencies in emergencies. On average, from 1 to 10 law enforcement agencies serve any given county. In the region of influence, the exception is Harris County, Texas, which is served by 36 law enforcement agencies.

A network of fire departments and districts provides fire protection and suppression services throughout the region of influence. Many of these organizations are staffed by volunteers, particularly in rural areas. In larger urban areas, fire protection staff typically is housed in fire stations. At the county level, the number of fire departments is approximately the same as the number of law enforcement agencies.

Table 3.10.1-10 also shows the nearest medical facilities to the proposed Project; specifically all critical access facilities that are located within 50 miles of the pipeline route. Non-federal, short-term, acute care facilities nearest the route are distinguished in the table based on their likelihood of serving Project-related medical needs. In every county along the pipeline route, there is at least one acute care facility within the county or nearby in a neighboring county. These facilities would provide emergency medical care and, in some cases, would serve as the base for local emergency medical response and transport services for construction accidents or operating concerns.

TABLE 3.10.1-10			
Existing Public Services and Facilities along the Project Route			
State / County¹	Police/Sheriff Departments²	Fire Departments²	Nearest Medical Facilities³
Steele City Segment - Montana			
Phillips	1	2	Phillips County Hospital (Malta)
Valley	4	3	Frances Mahon Deaconess Hospital (Glasgow)
McCone	2	1	McCone County Health Center (Circle)
Dawson	2	4	Glendive Medical Center (Glendive)
Prairie	2	1	Prairie Community Health Center (Terry)
Fallon	2	2	Fallon Medical Complex (Baker)
Steele City Segment - South Dakota			
Harding	2	3	
Butte	2	3	
Perkins	3	2	

² Education facilities are not addressed in the section because most construction workers are not expected to relocate with school-aged children; therefore, impacts on schools would be negligible.

**TABLE 3.10.1-10
Existing Public Services and Facilities along the Project Route**

State / County¹	Police/Sheriff Departments²	Fire Departments²	Nearest Medical Facilities³
Meade	4	6	Sturgis Regional Hospital (Sturgis)
Pennington	5	14	Rapid City Regional Hospital (Rapid City)
Haakon	2	3	Hans P. Peterson Memorial Hospital (Philip)
Jones	2	1	
Lyman	1	3	
Tripp	2	1	Winner Regional Healthcare Center (Winner)
Steele City Segment - Nebraska			
Keya Paha	1	2	
Rock	1	0	Rock County Hospital (Bassett)
Holt	5	2	Avera St. Anthony's Hospital (O'Neil)
Garfield	3	0	Valley County Hospital: Burwell Medical Clinic (Burwell)
Wheeler	1	0	
Greeley	2	3	
Boone	4	3	Boone County Health Center (Albion)
Nance	1	2	
Merrick	4	3	Litzenberg Memorial County Hospital (Central City)
Hamilton	2	4	Memorial Hospital (Aurora)
York	2	3	York General Hospital (York)
Fillmore	3	6	Fillmore County Hospital (Geneva)
Saline	4	5	
Jefferson	3	5	Jefferson Community Health Center (Fairbury); Thayer County Health Services (Hebron)
Keystone Cushing Extension Pump Stations - Kansas			
Clay ⁴	4	3	Clay County Medical Center (Clay Center); *Mercy Regional Health Center (Manhattan)
Butler ⁴	8	12	*Newton Medical Center (Newton); *Susan B. Allen Memorial Hospital (El Dorado); *Via Christi Riverside Medical Center (Wichita); *Wesley Medical Center (Wichita)
Gulf Coast Segment - Oklahoma			
Lincoln	9	6	Prague Municipal Hospital (Prague); Stroud Regional Medical Center (Stroud)
Creek	10	10	Bristow Medical Center (Bristow); Sapulpa Hospital (Sapulpa); Saint John Sapulpa (Sapulpa)
Okfuskee	4	6	Creek Nation Community Hospital (Okemah)
Seminole	5	6	Seminole Medical Center (Seminole)
Hughes	3	4	Holdenville General Hospital (Holdenville)
Coal	3	4	Mary Hurley Hospital (Coalgate)

**TABLE 3.10.1-10
Existing Public Services and Facilities along the Project Route**

State / County¹	Police/Sheriff Departments²	Fire Departments²	Nearest Medical Facilities³
Atoka	3	7	Atoka Memorial Hospital (Atoka)
Bryan	8	12	Medical Center of Southeastern Oklahoma (Durant)
Lincoln	9	6	Prague Municipal Hospital (Prague); Stroud Regional Medical Center (Stroud)
Gulf Coast Segment - Texas			
Fannin	8	6	Northeast Medical Center (Bonham)
Lamar	7	12	Saint Joseph's (Paris); Dubuis Hospital of Paris (Paris); Paris Regional Medical Center (Paris)
Delta	5	2	Wintermute Memorial Hospital (Klondike)
Hopkins	5	8	Hopkins County Memorial Hospital (Sulphur Springs)
Franklin	2	3	East Texas Medical Center (Mt. Vernon)
Wood	6	6	Presbyterian Hospital of Winnsboro (Winnsboro)
Upshur	4	7	
Smith	8	9	East Texas Medical Center (Tyler); Mother Frances Hospital (Tyler); University of Texas Health Center (Tyler)
Cherokee	5	6	Mother Frances Hospital (Jacksonville); Rusk State Hospital (Rusk)
Rusk	6	6	Henderson Memorial Hospital (Henderson)
Nacogdoches	4	11	Nacogdoches Medical Center (Nacogdoches)
Angelina	6	8	Woodland Heights Medical Center (Lufkin)
Polk	4	8	Memorial Medical Center (Livingston)
Liberty	6	11	Cleveland Regional Medical Center (Cleveland); Kersting Hospital (Liberty); Leggett Memorial Hospital (Cleveland); Liberty-Dayton Hospital (Liberty)
Hardin	6	4	
Jefferson	10	8	Saint Elizabeth Hospital (Beaumont); Debus Hospital of Beaumont (Beaumont); Memorial Herman Baptist (Beaumont) Saint Mary Hospital (Port Arthur); Promise Specialty Hospital of Southeast Texas (Port Arthur); Mid-Jefferson Hospital (Nederland);
Houston Lateral - Texas			
Liberty			<i>See Liberty County in Gulf Coast Segment, above</i>
Chambers	4	5	Bayside Community Hospital & Clinic (Anahuac) Bay Area Surgicare Center (Webster); Bayshore Medical Center (Pasadena);
Harris	36	41	Bayou City Medical Center (Houston); Ben Taub General Hospital (Houston); Children's Memorial Hermann Hospital (Houston);

**TABLE 3.10.1-10
Existing Public Services and Facilities along the Project Route**

State / County ¹	Police/Sheriff Departments ²	Fire Departments ²	Nearest Medical Facilities ³
			Saint Catherine Hospital (Katy); Saint John Hospital (Nassau Bay); Saint Joseph Hospital (Houston); Clear Lake Regional Medical Center (Webster); Cypress Creek Hospital (Houston); Cypress Fairbanks Medical Center (Houston); Dubuis Hospital of Houston (Houston); East Houston Regional Medical Center (Houston); Lyndon B. Johnson General Hospital (Houston); Quentin Mease Community Hospital (Houston); Kingwood Medical Center (Kingwood); Spring Branch Medical Center (Houston); West Houston Medical Center (Houston); Women’s Hospital of Texas (Houston) Hermann Hospital (Houston); Kindred Hospital Bay Area (Pasadena); Kindred Hospital Houston (Houston); Kindred Hospital Houston Northwest (Houston); Memorial Hermann Northwest Hospital (Houston); Memorial Hermann Katy Hospital (Katy); Memorial Hermann Southeast Hospital (Houston); Memorial Hermann Southwest Hospital (Houston); Methodist Hospital (Houston); Methodist Willowbrook Hospital (Houston); San Jacinto Methodist Hospital (Houston); Michael E. Debakey VA Medical Center (Houston); Park Plaza Hospital (Houston); Parkview Community Hospital (Houston) Saint Joseph Hospital (Houston); Saint Luke’s Episcopal Hospital (Houston); Twelve Oaks Medical Center (Houston); West Houston Medical Center (Houston); West Oaks Hospital (Houston)

3.10.1.7 Environmental Justice

Other demographic characteristics of the local population are important to consider when evaluating potential environmental justice impacts of the Project. Environmental justice refers to the “fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.” An analysis of potential environmental justice effects is included in this section pursuant to EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (1994). Related guidance—Environmental Justice: Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act (1997)—also has been prepared by the CEQ. The EPA has developed a GIS Mapping Tool to help identify areas of environmental justice concern within a state. This tool was used

to establish the demographic categories of concern.³ The key socioeconomic demographic data pertinent for environmental justice are the racial/ethnic composition and income status of affected communities, which are summarized in Table 3.10.1-11.

Minority Populations

In accordance with the CEQ Guidance, minority populations should be identified where either (a) the minority population in the affected area exceeds 50 percent; or (b) the minority population of the affected area is meaningfully greater than the minority population in the general population of the surrounding area. For the purposes of this analysis, the “affected area” is defined as county, the “general population” refers to the state within which the county is located, and “meaningfully greater” means at least 1.5 times the corresponding measure for the general population. The percent of minority populations and individuals living below the poverty level by county within the Project area are shown in Table 3.10.1-11.

³ See <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/environmentaljustice/assessment.html>

TABLE 3.10.1-11 Environmental Justice Statistics in Affected Communities along the Project Route									
County	Total Population	Total Population 2000							Percent of Individuals Living Below Poverty Line (2007)
		White	Black	Native American or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Hispanic ⁴	Other(a)	Two or More Races	
Steele City Segment									
Montana									
Phillips	4,601	89.4%	0.2%	7.6%	0.3%	1.2%	0.4%	2.1%	16.7%
Valley	7,675	88.1%	0.1%	9.4%*	0.2%	0.8%	0.3%	1.8%	14.8%
McCone	1,977	97.0%	0.3%	1.1%	0.3%	1.0%	0.0%	1.4%	11.8%
Dawson	9,059	97.4%	0.3%	1.2%	0.1%	0.9%	0.3%	0.6%	12.2%
Prairie	1,199	98.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	1.2%	13.1%
Fallon	2,837	98.6%	0.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%	0.5%	9.3%
<i>Subtotal Montana</i>	<i>902,195</i>	<i>98.3%</i>	<i>0.3%</i>	<i>6.2%</i>	<i>0.6%</i>	<i>2.0%</i>	<i>0.6%</i>	<i>1.7%</i>	<i>14.1%</i>
South Dakota									
Harding	1,353	97.6%	0.3%	0.7%	0.6%	1.6%	0.4%	0.4%	11.5%
Butte	9,094	95.5%	0.1%	1.6%	0.2%	2.9%*	1.1%*	1.4%	14.0%
Perkins	3,363	96.6%	0.1%	1.6%	0.2%	0.7%	0.5%	0.8%	13.7%
Meade	24,253	92.7%	1.5%*	2.0%	0.6%	2.1%	0.6%	2.5%*	9.8%
Pennington	88,656	86.7%	0.9%	8.1%	1.0%*	2.6%*	0.7%	2.7%*	12.4%
Haakon	2,196	96.4%	0.0%	2.5%	0.1%	0.6%	0.0%	1.0%	12.0%
Jones	1,193	95.8%	0.0%	2.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	1.5%	12.9%
Lyman	3,895	64.7%	0.1%	33.3%*	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	1.6%	22.9%*
Tripp	6,430	87.5%	0.0%	11.2%	0.1%	0.9%	0.1%	1.2%	18.4%
<i>Subtotal South Dakota</i>	<i>754,844</i>	<i>88.7%</i>	<i>0.6%</i>	<i>8.3%</i>	<i>0.6%</i>	<i>1.4%</i>	<i>0.5%</i>	<i>1.3%</i>	<i>13.2%</i>
Nebraska									
Keya Paha	983	99.6%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	0.4%	16.5%

TABLE 3.10.1-11 Environmental Justice Statistics in Affected Communities along the Project Route									
County	Total Population	Total Population 2000							Percent of Individuals Living Below Poverty Line (2007)
		White	Black	Native American or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Hispanic ⁴	Other(a)	Two or More Races	
Rock	1,756	99.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	0.3%	18.0%*
Holt	11,551	98.9%	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.4%	13.6%
Garfield	1,902	98.8%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	1.0%	0.4%	0.5%	14.2%
Wheeler	886	99.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.6%	0.6%	0.1%	14.9%
Greeley	2,714	97.9%	0.7%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%	0.8%	0.5%	14.3%
Boone	6,259	99.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.3%	0.3%	9.5%
Nance	4,038	98.4%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	1.1%	0.4%	0.7%	12.1%
Merrick	8,204	98.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	2.0%	0.7%	0.5%	9.2%
Hamilton	9,403	98.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	1.1%	0.5%	0.6%	8.0%
York	14,598	96.8%	1.0%	0.3%	0.6%	1.4%	0.6%	0.8%	9.1%
Fillmore	6,634	97.8%	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%	1.7%	0.8%	0.7%	11.7%
Saline	13,843	93.0%	0.4%	0.4%	1.7%	6.6%	3.4%	1.1%	9.4%
Jefferson	8,333	98.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	1.3%	0.5%	0.4%	10.8%
<i>Subtotal Nebraska</i>	<i>1,711,263</i>	<i>89.6%</i>	<i>4.0%</i>	<i>0.9%</i>	<i>1.3%</i>	<i>5.5%</i>	<i>2.8%</i>	<i>1.4%</i>	<i>11.1%</i>
Pump Stations - Kansas									
Clay	8,822	97.7%	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%	0.8%	0.3%	0.9%	9.5%
Butler	59,482	94.9%	1.4%	0.9%	0.4%	2.2%	0.7%	1.7%	7.9%
<i>Subtotal Kansas</i>	<i>2,688,418</i>	<i>86.1%</i>	<i>5.7%</i>	<i>0.9%</i>	<i>1.7%</i>	<i>7.0%</i>	<i>3.4%</i>	<i>2.1%</i>	<i>11.2%</i>
Gulf Coast Segment									
Kansas									
Atoka	13,879	75.9%	5.9%	11.4%	0.2%	1.4%	0.6%	6.1%	23.6%
Bryan	36,534	80.0%	1.4%	12.2%*	0.4%	2.6%	1.1%	4.8%	21.7%

TABLE 3.10.1-11 Environmental Justice Statistics in Affected Communities along the Project Route									
County	Total Population	Total Population 2000							Percent of Individuals Living Below Poverty Line (2007)
		White	Black	Native American or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Hispanic ⁴	Other(a)	Two or More Races	
Coal	6,031	75.2%	0.4%	17.3%*	0.3%	2.1%	0.7%	6.1%	24.4%*
Creek	67,367	82.3%	2.6%	9.1%	0.3%	1.9%	0.6%	5.2%	16.4%
Hughes	14,154	72.8%	4.5%	16.2%*	0.2%	2.5%	1.0%	5.4%	25.7%*
Lincoln	32,080	86.4%	2.5%	6.6%	0.2%	1.5%	0.4%	3.8%	16.4%
Okfuskee	11,814	65.5%	10.4%	18.2%*	0.1%	1.6%	0.6%	5.3%	21.9%
Payne	68,186	84.3%	3.6%	4.6%	3.0%*	2.1%	0.0%	0.5%	21.8%
Seminole	24,894	70.7%	5.6%	17.4%*	0.2%	2.2%	0.7%	5.3%	22.8%
Pontotoc	35,143	75.8%	2.1%	15.5%*	0.5%	2.3%	0.0%	4.9%	16.1%
<i>Subtotal Oklahoma</i>	<i>3,450,654</i>	<i>76.2%</i>	<i>7.6%</i>	<i>7.9%</i>	<i>1.5%</i>	<i>5.2%</i>	<i>2.4%</i>	<i>4.5%</i>	<i>15.8%</i>
Texas									
Angelina	80,130	66.4%	23.5%*	0.6%	0.4%	12.2%	8.0%	1.0%	19.3%
Cherokee	46,659	74.3%	16.0%	0.5%	0.5%	13.2%	7.4%	1.3%	18.6%
Delta	4,857	87.9%	8.3%	0.8%	0.1%	3.1%	1.2%	1.7%	17.7%
Fannin	31,242	86.6%	8.0%	0.9%	0.3%	5.6%	2.8%	1.5%	16.5%
Franklin	9,458	89.2%	3.9%	0.6%	0.2%	8.9%	5.1%	0.9%	14.4%
Hardin	48,073	90.9%	6.9%	0.3%	0.2%	2.5%	0.7%	0.9%	11.2%
Hopkins	31,960	85.1%	8.0%	0.7%	0.2%	9.3%	4.6%	1.4%	14.6%
Jefferson	252,051	57.2%	33.7%*	0.3%	2.9%	10.5%	4.3%	1.5%	17.1%
Lamar	48,499	82.5%	13.5%	1.1%*	0.4%	3.3%	1.2%	1.4%	16.2%
Liberty	70,154	78.9%	12.8%	0.5%	0.3%	10.9%	6.0%	1.4%	14.4%
Nacogdoches	59,203	75.0%	16.7%	0.4%	0.7%	11.2%	5.7%	1.4%	21.1%
Polk	41,133	79.3%	13.2%	1.7%*	0.4%	9.4%	3.7%	1.3%	17.5%
Rusk	47,372	74.9%	19.2%	0.2%*	0.2%	8.4%	4.2%	1.1%	13.1%

TABLE 3.10.1-11 Environmental Justice Statistics in Affected Communities along the Project Route									
County	Total Population	Total Population 2000							Percent of Individuals Living Below Poverty Line (2007)
		White	Black	Native American or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Hispanic ⁴	Other(a)	Two or More Races	
Smith	174,706	72.6%	19.1%	0.4%	0.7%	11.2%	5.7%	1.4%	14.3%
Upshur	35,291	85.7%	10.1%	0.6%	0.2%	4.0%	2.1%	1.2%	15.7%
Wood	36,752	89.1%	6.1%	0.6%	0.2%	5.7%	2.9%	1.1%	11.9%
<i>Subtotal Texas (Gulf coast Segment)</i>	<i>1,017,540</i>	<i>71.0%</i>	<i>11.5%</i>	<i>0.6%</i>	<i>2.8%</i>	<i>32.0%</i>	<i>11.7%</i>	<i>2.5%</i>	<i>16.3%</i>
Houston Lateral									
Texas									
Liberty	See above	Liberty	See above	Liberty	See above	Liberty	See above	Liberty	See above
Chambers	26,031	81.9%	9.8%	0.5%	0.7%	10.8%	6.0%	1.2%	8.6%
Harris	3,400,578	58.7%	18.5%	0.4%	5.1%	32.9%	14.2%	3.0%	16.3%
<i>Subtotal Texas (Houston Lateral)</i>	<i>20,851,820</i>	<i>71.0%</i>	<i>11.5%</i>	<i>0.6%</i>	<i>2.8%</i>	<i>32.0%</i>	<i>11.7%</i>	<i>2.5%</i>	<i>16.3%</i>
<i>Subtotal Texas</i>	<i>20,851,820</i>	<i>71.0%</i>	<i>11.5%</i>	<i>0.6%</i>	<i>2.8%</i>	<i>32.0%</i>	<i>11.7%</i>	<i>2.5%</i>	<i>16.3%</i>
U.S.		75.0%	12.3%	0.9%	3.7%	12.5%	5.5%	2.4%	13.0%

Notes: (a) Other accounts for those individuals who marked "Some other race", a category included in the 2000 Census for respondents who were unable to identify with the five Office of Management and Budget race categories. Respondents who provided write-in entries such as Moroccan, South African, Belizean, or a Hispanic origin (for example, Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban) are included in the some other race category. (<http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf>)

Source: **Population:** US Census: QT-P3. Race and Hispanic or Latino: 2000. Percent of Individuals Living Below Poverty Line: Table 1: 2007 Poverty and Median Income Estimates – Counties, U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Estimates Branch Release date: 12.2008.

The 2000 Census shows that no minority group exceeds 50 percent of the population in any county along the Project route. Minority populations that are meaningfully greater than the corresponding minority population at the state level are identified with an asterisk (*) in the relevant racial/ethnic category columns of Table 3.10.1-11 and listed in Table 3.10.1-12. In the Steele City Segment there are nine combinations of minority population within a county that are meaningfully greater than the corresponding state population. One of those is the Native American or Alaska Native population in Valley, Montana. The other eight populations are located in South Dakota counties and include Black, Native American or Alaska Natives, Asian or Pacific Islanders, Hispanic and 'Other'. In Kansas there are no minority populations within a county that are meaningfully greater than the corresponding state population. In the Gulf Coast Segment there is one combination of minority population within one county that has a population greater than 50 percent of the total population. Also in the Gulf Coast Segment there are 13 combinations of minority populations within counties that are meaningfully greater than the corresponding state population. Nine of those populations are located in Oklahoma and are comprised of Native Americans or Alaska Natives and Asian or Pacific Islander. The remaining four populations are located in Texas and include Blacks and Native Americans or Alaska Natives. Along the Houston Lateral there are two combinations of minority population within a county that are meaningfully greater than the corresponding state population. Both populations are in Harris County. The populations are Black and Asian or Pacific Islander.

TABLE 3.10.1-12		
Minority Populations Meaningfully Greater than Corresponding States' Minority Population		
Minority Population	County	State
Steele City Segment		
Native American or Alaska Native	Valley	Montana
	Meade	South Dakota
	Butte	South Dakota
Asian or Pacific Islander	Pennington	South Dakota
	Butte	South Dakota
Hispanic	Pennington	South Dakota
	Butte	South Dakota
Other	Butte	South Dakota
	Meade	South Dakota
Two or More Races	Meade	South Dakota
	Pennington	South Dakota
Gulf Coast Segment		
Black	Angelina	Texas
	Jefferson	Texas
	Rusk	Texas
	Smith	Texas
Native American or Alaska Native	Bryan	Oklahoma
	Coal	Oklahoma
	Hughes	Oklahoma
	Okfuskee	Oklahoma
	Seminole	Oklahoma
	Pontotoc	Oklahoma
	Lamar	Texas

TABLE 3.10.1-12		
Minority Populations Meaningfully Greater than Corresponding States' Minority Population		
Minority Population	County	State
	Polk	Texas
Asian or Pacific Islander	Payne	Oklahoma
Houston Lateral		
Black	Harris	Texas
Asian or Pacific Islander	Harris	Texas

Source: ENTRIX analysis from Census Data.

Low-Income Populations

Low-income populations in the region of influence were identified and evaluated using poverty statistics from the U.S. Census, namely the percentage of individuals living below the poverty level. If the percentage of population living below the poverty line was greater in a county than the state in which it is located, it was considered to be a low-income population; these communities are noted with an asterisk (*) in the far right column of Table 3.10.1-11.

The income characteristics of the states and counties along the proposed pipeline route vary. Four states, Montana, South Dakota, Oklahoma and Texas have higher rates of low-income populations than the U.S. rate of 13.0 percent. The highest rate is in Texas with 16.3 percent of low-income populations. In total, 31 of the 59 counties that comprise the Project area are low income. Along the Steele City Segment 14 out of 29 counties are low income, as are two counties in Montana, four counties in South Dakota, and eight counties in Nebraska. None of the counties in Kansas are classified as low income. Along the Gulf Coast Segment seventeen of the thirty counties are low income. All 10 of the counties in Oklahoma and seven of the eighteen counties in Texas are considered low income.

The highest rate of low income is found in Hughes county Oklahoma where 25.7 percent of the individuals lived below the poverty line. The state with the most counties considered low income is Oklahoma, with 10 counties ranging between 16.1 percent (Pontotoc County) and 25.7 percent (Hughes County).

3.10.1.8 Traffic and Transportation

Highways, Major Roads and Rural Roads

The Project would meet or intersect many local, state, federal, and interstate roadways along its length. This section provides information on those roads using GIS data. The GIS data are accurate to plus or minus (+/-) 167 feet (ESRI 2008). Consequently, while the data are not intended for survey positional accuracy, they nonetheless provide adequate information to describe the roads crossed. The roads have been classified into four categories based on the U.S. Census Feature Class Codes:

- Category I: Local, Neighborhood, Rural or City roads;
- Category II: Secondary State and County Highways;
- Category III: Primary US and State Highways; and
- Category IV: Primary Limited Access or Interstate.

The roads in rural areas are well developed within the states the Project would cross. Keystone would require the construction contractors to submit a road use plan prior to mobilization, to coordinate with the appropriate state and county representatives to develop a mutually acceptable plan, and to obtain all necessary road permits. Keystone would have inspection personnel ensure that the construction contractor complies with these road use plans and road use permits.

Steele City Segment

The Steele City Segment extends from the border crossing near Morgan, Montana to Steele City, Nebraska. The Steele City Segment passes through Montana, South Dakota and extends to the southern border of Nebraska. This segment of the pipeline would cross three Interstate Highways; I-94, I-90 and I-80 (see Figure 3.10.1-1).

The Steele City Segment would meet or intersect with a total of 713 roads in Categories I, II, III, and IV (Table 3.10.1-13), with the largest number of crossings in Montana (265), followed by Nebraska (258) and South Dakota (190).

TABLE 3.10.1-13			
Intersections of Steele City Segment with Roads, by State			
State	Road Category	Road Name	Number of Road Intersections
Montana	Category I		250
	Category II	Marsh Rd	1
		Old Us Hwy 10	1
		River Rd	1
		Rock Creek Rd	1
		SR 117	1
		SR 24	1
		SR 243	1
		SR 7	1
		Weldon Rd	1
		Category III	SR 13
	SR 200		2
	US 12		1
	US 2		1
Category IV	I 94	1	
Montana Total			265
Nebraska	Category I		236
	Category II	SR 11	1
		SR 12	1
		SR 137	1
		SR 14	1
		SR 15	1
		SR 22	1
		SR 4	1
		SR 41	1
SR 56	1		

TABLE 3.10.1-13
Intersections of Steele City Segment with Roads, by State

State	Road Category	Road Name	Number of Road Intersections	
	Category III	SR 66	1	
		SR 70	1	
		SR 74	1	
		SR 8	1	
		SR 92	1	
		US 136	1	
		US 20	1	
		US 281	1	
		US 30	1	
		US 34	1	
		US 6	1	
		US 81	1	
		Category IV	I 80	1
		Nebraska Total		
South Dakota	Category I		171	
	Category II	Bad River Rd	1	
		CR 35	1	
		CR 797	1	
		CR 867	1	
		CR S6 Jones	1	
		CR S9 Jones	1	
		SR 16	1	
		SR 20	1	
		SR 34	1	
		SR 53	1	
		SR 73	1	
		SR 79	1	
		Category III	US 14	1
	US 18		1	
	US 183		2	
	US 212		1	
	US 85		1	
	Category IV	I 90	1	
	South Dakota Total			190
Total Steele City Intersections			713	

Notes:

SR = State Road
 US = U.S. Highway
 I = Interstate
 CR = County Road

Gulf Coast Segment

The Gulf Coast Segment passes through Oklahoma and Texas, starting from Cushing, Oklahoma and extending to Nederland in Jefferson County, Texas. This segment would cross Interstate Highways I-44, I-40, I-30, I-20 and I-10. It would also parallel SR 146 in Texas for approximately 7.5 miles (see Figure 3.10.1-2). The Gulf Coast Segment would meet or intersect with 489 roads in Categories I, II, III, and IV (Table 3.10.1-14). The total includes 336 in Texas and 153 in Oklahoma.

TABLE 3.10.1-14			
Intersections of Gulf Coast Segment with Roads, by State			
State	Road Category	Road Name	Number of Road Intersections
Oklahoma	Category I		138
	Category II	SR 1	1
		SR 3	1
		SR 31	1
		SR 56	1
		SR 7	1
		SR 9	1
		SR 99	1
		SR 99a	1
	Category III	SR 66	1
		US 270	1
		US 62	1
		US 69	1
		US 70	1
	Category IV	I 40	1
		I 44	1
Oklahoma Total		153	
Texas	Category I		268
	Category II	Berard	1
		E Fm 852	1
		Fm 137	1
		Fm 16	1
		Fm 1911	1
		Fm 2122	1
		Fm 225	2
		Fm 2352	1
		Fm 2869	1
		Fm 3357	1
		Fm 343	1
		Fm 38	2
		Fm 62	1
		Fm 71	1
		Fm 770	1
Fm 787	1		

**TABLE 3.10.1-14
Intersections of Gulf Coast Segment with Roads, by State**

State	Road Category	Road Name	Number of Road Intersections
		Fm 79	1
		Fm 839	1
		Fm 900	1
		Fm 942	2
		Fm 943	1
		Fm Road 2088	1
		Fm Road 69	1
		Hillebrandt Rd	1
		HWY 1448	1
		S Major Dr	1
		S Pine Island Rd	1
		SE Fm 13	1
		SR 103	1
		SR 105	1
		SR 11	1
		SR 124	1
		SR 135	1
		SR 146	2
		SR 154	1
		SR 155	1
		SR 19	1
		SR 204	1
		SR 21	1
		SR 31	1
		SR 326	1
		SR 347	1
		SR 37	1
		SR 64	1
		SR 7	1
		SR 94	1
		Tyrrell Park Rd	1
		W Port Arthur Rd	1
		Walden Rd	1
	Category III	US 190	1
		US 271	1
		US 287	1
		US 59	1
		US 67	1
		US 69	2
		US 79	1
		US 80	1

TABLE 3.10.1-14			
Intersections of Gulf Coast Segment with Roads, by State			
State	Road Category	Road Name	Number of Road Intersections
		US 82	1
		US 84	1
		US 90	1
	Category IV	I 10	1
		I 20	1
		I 30	1
Texas Total			336
Total Intersections			489

Source: ESRI Data & Maps 9.3 [DVD]. (2008). Redlands, California, USA: Environmental Systems Research Institute.

Houston Lateral

The Houston Lateral extends from the Gulf Coast Segment in Liberty County Texas, for approximately 49 miles to Harris County, Texas. This segment would intersect U.S. Highway 90 (see Figure 3.10.1-3). The Houston Lateral would meet or intersect with 51 roads (see Table 3.10.1-15). All are in Categories I, II, and III.

TABLE 3.10.1-15			
Intersections of Houston Lateral with Roads			
State	Road Category	Road Name	Number of Road Intersections
Texas	Category I		43
	Category II	Fm 1409	1
		Fm 160	1
		Fm 1942 Rd	1
		Fm 563	1
		Sheldon Rd	1
		SR 134	1
		SR 146	1
	Category III	US 90	1
Texas Total			51
Total Intersections			

Source: ESRI Data & Maps 9.3 [DVD]. (2008). Redlands, California, USA: Environmental Systems Research Institute.

Railroads

The Project would also cross several railway service tracks. Table 3.10.1-16 lists the railroad names and owners. The roads are listed alphabetically by state rather than by segment because some states include more than one segment. As shown, there are expected to be 80 total intersections, including 17 in Kansas, 8 in Montana, 7 in Nebraska, 12 in Oklahoma, 2 in South Dakota, and 34 in Texas.

The Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) has main, branch, and spur tracks in the states which would be traversed by the pipeline.⁴ The proposed pipeline route would cross the BNSF main tracks in the Montana Operating Division running between Snowden and Shelby and between Snowden and Jones Junction. In Nebraska, the proposed pipeline would cross the BNSF main track in the Nebraska Operating Division between Lincoln and Hastings. In the BNSF Kansas Operating Division, the proposed pipeline would cross two main tracks, one between Newton and Los Animas Junction and the other between Wichita and Amarillo (Texas). The proposed pipeline route would also cross several branch tracks, spurs, and short line tracks throughout the BNSF system area.

The Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) has main, branch, and spur track throughout Nebraska and Kansas as well as other states which would not be affected by the proposed pipeline Project route.⁵ In Nebraska, the proposed route would cross a UPRR main track between Omaha and North Platte. In Kansas, the proposed route would cross several main tracks connecting Topeka, Wichita, and other cities. In Oklahoma and Texas, the proposed pipeline route would cross UPRR main tracks running between Dallas and Houston and other cities in Texas and Louisiana.

Other railroads would also be crossed by the proposed pipeline route in Nebraska, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Texas. These include Southern Kansas and Oklahoma; United States Gypsum; Nebraska Central Railroad; Stillwater Central Railroad; Kiamichi Railroad; Dakota, Minnesota and Eastern Railroad; Dakota Southern Railway; Dallas, Garland, and Northeastern Railroad; Moscow Camden and San Augustine Railroad; Kansas City Southern Railroad; Texas Southeast Railway; and Port Terminal Railroad Association.

TABLE 3.10.1-16			
Intersection of Project with Railroads, by Segment and State			
Pipeline Segment	Railroad Name	Railroad Owner (Reporting Mark)	Number of Rail Intersections
Kansas - Cushing Extension			
	A T and S F Railway	BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe)	2
	A T and SF Railway	BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe)	1
	A T and SF Railway	BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe)	2
	<i>Unnamed</i>	SKOL (Southern Kansas & Oklahoma)	1
	Chicago Rock Island and Pacific Railroad	UP (Union Pacific)	3
	Federal Railroad Administration	BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe)	1
	Missouri Pacific Railroad	UP (Union Pacific)	1
	Missouri Pacific Railroad	UP (Union Pacific)	1
	Union Pacific Railroad	UP (Union Pacific)	5
Kansas Total			17
Montana - Steele City Segment			
	Burlington Northern Railroad	BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe)	7
	<i>Unnamed</i>	USG (United States Gypsum)	1
Montana Total			8
Nebraska - Cushing Extension			

⁴ See the BNSF system map at http://www.bnsf.com/tools/reference/division_maps, accessed August 3, 2009.

⁵ See the UPRR system map at <http://www.uprr.com/aboutup/maps/sysmap/index.shtml>, accessed August 3, 2009.

**TABLE 3.10.1-16
Intersection of Project with Railroads, by Segment and State**

Pipeline Segment	Railroad Name	Railroad Owner (Reporting Mark)	Number of Rail Intersections
Nebraska - Steele City Segment	Union Pacific Railroad	UP (Union Pacific)	1
	Burlington Northern Railroad	BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe)	3
	Chicago Rock Island and Pacific Railroad	UP (Union Pacific)	1
	Union Pacific Railroad	NCRC (Nebraska Central Railroad Company)	1
	<i>Unnamed</i>	UP (Union Pacific)	1
Nebraska Total			7
Oklahoma - Cushing Extension			
	A T and SF Railway	BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe)	2
	<i>Unnamed</i>	SLWC (Stillwater Central Railroad)	1
	St. Louis-San Francisco Railway	BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe)	1
Oklahoma - Gulf Coast Segment			
	Burlington Northern Railroad	BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe)	3
	<i>unnamed</i>	KRR (Kiamichi Railroad)	1
	<i>unnamed</i>	SLWC (Stillwater Central Railroad)	3
	Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad	UP (Union Pacific)	1
Oklahoma Total			12
South Dakota - Steele City Segment			
	Chicago and Northwestern Railway	DME (Dakota Minnesota & Eastern Railroad Corporation)	1
	South Dakota State Railroad	DSRC (Dakota Southern Railway Company)	1
South Dakota Total			2
Texas - Gulf Coast Segment			
	AT and SF Railway	BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe)	1
	Kansas City Southern Railway (KCS)	KCS (Kansas City Southern Railway)	9
	Missouri Pacific Railroad	DGNO (Dallas, Garland & Northeastern Railroad, Inc.)	1
	<i>unnamed</i>	UP (Union Pacific)	1
	Moscow Camden San Augustine RR	MCSA (Moscow Camden San Augustine RR)	1
	Railroad	UP (Union Pacific)	1
	P Railroad	UP (Union Pacific)	2
	Southern Pacific Railroad	UP (Union Pacific)	1
	<i>unnamed</i>	BLR	1
	<i>unnamed</i>	BNSF (Burlington Northern Santa Fe)	3
	<i>unnamed</i>	KCS (Kansas City Southern Railway)	1

TABLE 3.10.1-16 Intersection of Project with Railroads, by Segment and State			
Pipeline Segment	Railroad Name	Railroad Owner (Reporting Mark)	Number of Rail Intersections
	<i>unnamed</i>	TSE (Texas Southeast Railway)	2
	<i>unnamed</i>	UP (Union Pacific)	4
Texas - Houston Lateral			
	Missouri Pacific Railroad	PTRA (Port Terminal Railroad Association)	1
	Railroad	UP (Union Pacific)	2
	Southern Pacific Railroad	UP (Union Pacific)	1
	<i>unnamed</i>	UP (Union Pacific)	2
Texas Total			34
Total Intersections			80

Source: ESRI Data & Maps 9.3 [DVD]. (2008). Redlands, California, USA: Environmental Systems Research Institute.

3.10.2 Potential Impacts and Mitigation

3.10.2.1 Socioeconomics

The socioeconomic consequences of constructing and operating the Project would vary in duration and magnitude. From a temporal perspective, impacts are characterized as temporary, short term, long term, or permanent. Impacts are considered in the context of duration, magnitude (relative to baseline conditions), and any proposed measures or activities that Keystone would implement as part of the proposed Project. The following impact thresholds for social and economic impacts were used in the analysis:

- Changes to local social or economic activities, including changes in employment and income levels, resulting from the proposed pipeline construction and operations.
- Overburdening of the local housing stock because of demand generated by the temporary and permanent workforce.
- Substantial changes in private property values.
- Substantial changes in fiscal revenues, including tax receipts, of local jurisdictions.
- Substantial burden on public service providers serving the Project area such that they would need to expand their service capacities in order to meet those demands.

Impacts are characterized as positive (beneficial) or negative (adverse) and, where possible, are evaluated relative to regional conditions to help assess the magnitude of socioeconomic effects.

3.10.2.2 Environmental Justice

As described in Section 3.10.1.7 and shown in Table 3.10.1-11, portions of the new pipeline and new and upgraded pumping stations are located in areas with minority populations and with families living below the poverty level (31 of the 59 counties that comprise the Project area are low income, for a full

description of the number and location of these counties see Section 3.10.1.7). The Project also is located in areas of majority populations (18 out of the 59 counties). The 2000 Census shows that no minority group exceeds 50 percent of the population in any county along the Project route. The Project is not expected to result in adverse impacts that would fall disproportionately on minority or low-income populations located along the pipeline route. Public participation in assessing the Project is especially important in areas where low-income populations and/or minority populations have the potential to be affected. Public outreach would continue throughout the life of the Project (Keystone 2009).

3.10.2.3 Construction Impacts

Keystone would construct approximately 1,380 miles of new pipeline, 30 pump stations and other ancillary facilities as listed in Table 3.10.2-1. Construction activities would involve the movement of people, equipment, and materials on roadways throughout the Project area. In some cases, construction may increase the demands for permits for vehicle load and width limits (Keystone 2008). Some temporary traffic delays are likely. However, Keystone would provide vehicle access and would assist traffic flows in construction areas including emergency vehicles (Appendix B, CMR Plan).

Each state has various road construction projects planned or underway. However, because specific construction dates for the Project are unknown, potential conflicts with roadway construction are uncertain. Nonetheless, construction across roads and highways would comply with the requirements of the road crossing permits and approvals obtained by Keystone (Appendix B, CMR Plan).

TABLE 3.10.2-1 Construction Projects by State		
Segment/State	New Construction Pipeline Miles	Ancillary Facilities
Steele City Segment		
Montana	282.5	6 new pump stations, 14 main line valves (MLVs), 50 access roads
South Dakota	314.1	7 new pump stations, 9 MLVs, 18 access roads
Nebraska	254.1	5 new pump stations, 13 MLVs, Steele City Tank Farm, 12 access roads
Keystone Cushing Extension		
Kansas	0	2 new pump stations and no access roads
Gulf Coast Segment		
Oklahoma	155.4	4 new pump stations, 10 MLVs, 93 access roads
Texas	324.8	6 new pump stations, 21 MLVs, 1 delivery site, 245 access roads
Houston Lateral		
Texas – Houston Lateral	48.6	7 MLVs, 1 delivery site, 31 access roads
Total	1,379.5	

Source: Keystone 2009c.

Construction of the pipeline is planned to occur in 17 construction spreads or completed lengths (Table 3.10.2-2). Ten spreads are planned along the Steele City Segment, six spreads along the Gulf Coast Segment and one spread along the Houston Lateral. Keystone anticipates 500 to 600 construction and inspection personnel associated with each spread, except for the Houston Lateral, which would require

approximately 250 workers. Each spread would require 6 to 8 months to complete. Construction of new pump stations would require 20 to 30 additional workers at each site. Construction of all pump stations would be completed in 18 to 24 months.

Keystone, through its construction contractors and subcontractors, would attempt to hire temporary construction staff from the local population. Provided qualified personnel are available, approximately 10 to 15 percent (50 to 100 people) may be hired from the local work force for each spread. This may not be possible in more rural areas. The number of individuals in the work force for each county where a base for construction is planned is listed in Table 3.10.2-2.

TABLE 3.10.2-2 Pipeline Construction Spreads of the Proposed Project				
Spread Number	Location	Approximate Length of Construction Spread (miles)	Base(s) for Construction¹	Work Force in Respective Counties^(a) (2008)
Steele City Segment				
Spread 1	MP 0 to 81	81	Hinsdale, Montana, and Glasgow, Montana (both in Valley County)	3,649
Spread 2	MP 81 to 163	82	Glasgow, Montana (Valley County), and Circle, Montana (McCone County)	3,649 (Valley, County) and 1,015 (McCone County)
Spread 3	MP 163 to 247	84	Glendive, Montana (Dawson County), and Baker, Montana (Fallon County)	4,386 (Dawson County) and 1,824 (Fallon County)
Spread 4	MP 247to 333	86	Buffalo, South Dakota (Harding County)	762
Spread 5	MP 333 to 415	82	Faith, South Dakota, and Union Center, South Dakota (both in Meade County)	12,579
Spread 6	MP 415 to 500	85	Phillip, South Dakota (Haakon County)	1,154
Spread 7	MP 500 to 580	80	Murdo, South Dakota (Jones County), and Winner, South Dakota (Tripp County)	694 (Jones County) and 2,935 Tripp County)
Spread 8	MP 580 to 664	84	Fairfax, Nebraska (Custer, Nebraska) Stuart, Nebraska, and O'Neill, Nebraska (both in Holt County)	6,092 (Custer County) and 6,092 (Holt County)
Spread 9	MP 664 to 758	94	Greeley, Nebraska (Greeley County), and Central City, Nebraska (Merrick County)	1,298 (Greeley County) and 4,296 (Merrick County)
Spread 10	MP 758 to 851	93	York (York County), Nebraska, Beatrice, Nebraska (Gage County), and Fairbury, Nebraska (Jefferson County)	7,115 (York County) and 4,394 (Jefferson County)
Gulf Coast Segment				
Spread 1	MP 0 to 95	95	Holdenville, Oklahoma (Hughes County)	5,046
Spread 2	MP 95 to 185	90	Paris, Texas (Lamar County)	23,811 (Lamar County)
Spread 3	MP 185 to	99	Mt. Pleasant, Texas (Titus	617

**TABLE 3.10.2-2
Pipeline Construction Spreads of the Proposed Project**

Spread Number	Location	Approximate Length of Construction Spread (miles)	Base(s) for Construction¹	Work Force in Respective Counties^(a) (2008)
	284		County)	
Spread 4	MP 284 to 366	82	Henderson, Texas (Rusk County), Nacogdoches, Texas (Nacogdoches County) Crockett, Texas Houston County)	24,081 (Rusk County) and 30,614 Nacogdoches County)
Spread 5	MP 366 to 433	67	Lufkin, Texas (Angelina County)	38,987 (Angelina County)
Spread 6	MP 433 to 480	47	Sour Lake, Texas (Hardin County)	25,947 (Hardin County)
Houston Lateral				
Spread 7	MP 0 to 49	49	Sour Lake, Texas, Liberty, Texas (Chambers County), Dayton, Texas (Liberty County)	14,254 (Chambers County) and 31,455 (Liberty County)

¹ Some of the communities listed above were not included in Table 3.10.2 because they are located more than two miles from the proposed pipeline.

Source: Keystone 2009c. (a) Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics, County Data. <http://www.bls.gov/lau/#tables>

Population

The number of residents within the region of influence would increase temporarily during construction with the influx of construction workers and Project staff. The construction workforce would consist of approximately 5,000 to 6,000 workers, including Keystone employees, contractor employees, and construction and environmental inspection staff. These workers would be distributed across the pipeline route by construction spread, with approximately 500 to 600 construction personnel allocated to each spread. Construction of the pump stations and delivery facilities would require additional staff. It is anticipated that an additional 20 to 30 workers per station would be required. Tank farm construction would involve approximately 30 to 40 construction personnel over a period of 15 to 18 months concurrent with the Steele City Segment construction.

Population impacts in the region of influence would depend on the composition of the construction workforce in terms of local versus non-local workers and the existing population of the area. Keystone would utilize temporary local construction labor where possible. It is estimated that 10 to 15 percent of the total construction workforce could be hired from local communities, with the remaining workers (85 to 90 percent) from outside the local area. Few non-local workers would be expected to be accompanied by their children or other family members because of the mobile nature of the workforce along the pipeline route during construction.

Based on these data and assumptions, it is estimated that 4,500 to 5,100 non-local residents would temporarily move into the region of influence, resulting in short-term population increases during the construction period. These workers would be distributed throughout the region of influence according to construction spread, thereby potentially affecting isolated communities along the pipeline route. Because of the relative differences in existing population along the proposed route, impacts may vary by area. For example, the existing population in the affected area in Montana was 23,747 in 2007 (See Table 3.10.10-

4, U.S Census). The three planned spreads and the 6 new pump stations in Montana, if constructed concurrently could cause local population to increase by about 8.0 percent. However, since construction on spreads is planned sequentially the impact on the population in Montana is more likely between 4 percent and 5 percent. In South Dakota and Nebraska, a similar sized construction effort would only result in a change in existing population of approximately 1.0 percent because some of the counties in South Dakota and Nebraska are more densely populated. Depending on the size of the local community and duration of stay, the influx of construction workers may result in a range of short-term socioeconomic effects. These potential temporary increases in local population levels are addressed in the analysis of related resource topics in this section, including housing and public services.

Housing

Non-local construction workers moving into the region of influence would require short-term accommodations. Because workers are not expected to relocate with their families and their stay in any one community would be temporary, it is expected that most workers would use temporary housing, such as hotels/motels, RV sites, and campgrounds. Most workers likely would prefer short-term accommodations, primarily hotels and motels, in the more populated, service-oriented communities located within a reasonable commuting distance from the work site. As local accommodations fill, workers would be forced to seek alternative accommodations, including RV parks and campgrounds, in smaller, more distant communities. Further, some employees may elect to utilize furnished apartments and rental homes due to the constrained availability of other accommodations, although this is expected to be limited based on extended-period lease requirements. Depending on location and available accommodations, workers may elect to reside temporarily in one location during the construction period or relocate within each spread as needed as construction proceeds along the pipeline route.

There could be a need for nearly 2,900 housing units throughout the region of influence, or 450 to 510 housing units within any one construction spread, assuming that each worker would require his/her own unit. The availability of short-term housing varies across the pipeline route. In total, there are approximately 91,000 vacant rentals, 30,000 hotel/motel rooms and 4,700 RV sites available to serve the housing needs of the Project. The anticipated Project-related demand for housing would account for about 5 percent of all available temporary housing in the region of influence, or 17.0 percent of hotel/motel rooms plus RV sites. At a regional scale, therefore, it appears that the temporary housing available within the region of influence would be sufficient to meet the temporary and moderately increased demand for housing resulting from construction activities.

In the northern, more rural portions of the pipeline route, particularly Montana and Nebraska and Kansas, it may be difficult to meet the local housing needs based on the limited amount of short-term accommodations in proximity to the Project. Based on an in-depth housing analysis and on updated discussions with construction contractors, Keystone would rely on temporary construction camps to house workers in remote areas. These temporary camps would supplement local housing in remote areas of Montana and South Dakota for the duration of construction in the area. Keystone currently anticipates the need for four temporary construction camps, to be located in the general vicinity of Nashua and Baker, Montana, and close to Union Center and Winner, South Dakota. Each construction camp would be capable of housing up to 600 workers. Camps would typically include sleeping areas with shared and private baths, craft rooms, recreation facilities, media rooms, kitchen/dining facilities, laundry facilities, a security/infirmiry unit, offices, and wastewater treatment facilities. These temporary construction camps would be permitted, constructed, and operated in compliance with applicable county, state, and federal regulations (Keystone 2009).

Conversely, in more urban areas, such as most of Texas and Oklahoma, short-term housing is more abundant, particularly hotels and motels; therefore, it is more likely that the available housing stock in

proximity to the Project would be sufficient to meet the increased housing demands generated by the Project.

Local Economic Activity

The proposed pipeline has the potential to generate substantial direct and indirect economic benefits for local and regional economies along the pipeline route. During construction, these benefits are derived from the construction labor requirements of the Project and spending on construction goods and services that would not otherwise have occurred if the line were not built. At the local level, these benefits would be in the form of employment of local labor as part of the construction workforce and related income benefits from wage earnings, construction expenditures made at local businesses, and construction worker spending in the local economy. However, if a person leaves an existing job to take a job building the proposed pipeline only the additional income earned by that person would be considered a benefit of the Project. The Project job obtained by the local worker would become a local Project-related benefit when the job that was left is filled by another worker.

Construction of the proposed Project, including the pipeline and pump stations, would result in hiring approximately 5,000 to 6,000 workers over the 3 year construction period. As indicated above, it is expected that roughly 10 to 15 percent of the construction workforce would be hired from local labor markets, thus 500 to 900 local workers throughout the entire region of influence would be hired, or 50 to 90 local workers per construction spread. Related income benefits would be substantial. Some short-term shifting in local job distribution may occur in all areas as a result of the proposed pipeline. This job shifting could cause short-term labor shortages in other areas of local economies due to workers leaving existing jobs for jobs on the Project.

In addition to payroll spending, construction would generate substantial expenditures on goods and services, both inside and outside of the region of influence. Typically, such spending includes outlays for fuel supplies, hardware needs, and parts/equipment.

Construction also would generate indirect local economic benefits from secondary activity spurred by the direct effects described above. This would include short-term benefits of increased business to local and statewide businesses supplying supplies and services to Project workers. Such businesses would include equipment suppliers, restaurants, gas stations and hotels. Spending by the non-local construction workforce within local economies during the construction period could include expenditures on food, clothing, lodging, gasoline, and entertainment. The extent of local spending by non-local workers would be tied to labor earnings and individual spending patterns. Construction worker spending, in conjunction with outlays for construction goods and services, also would generate indirect economic benefits as these monetary flows circulate throughout the economy based on economic linkages among industries. These “ripple” effects, commonly referred to as “multiplier effects,” result from businesses buying from other businesses and can generate additional economic benefits within the region of influence. These impacts, however, have not been quantified for this analysis.

Labor and income benefits also would extend outside the region of influence based on the employment of non-local labor for the Project and expenditures on construction materials and services that would be imported into the area. Although these benefits would not be realized locally, they do represent a positive economic impact at the national level.

Overall, construction of the proposed Project would result in a positive impact on the local economies in the region of influence.

Tax Revenue and Fiscal Resources

The fiscal benefits of the Project include short-term tax revenues generated during construction and long-term tax revenues associated with property tax payments. The Project is not expected to require substantial new government expenditures. The range of potential tax revenues during construction is described below.

In the short term, the predominant source of tax revenues would be sales/use and fuel taxes levied on goods and services purchased during the construction period. This includes, for example, construction materials and construction worker spending in the local economy for basic living expenses such as food, housing, gasoline, and entertainment. It is difficult to quantify these short-term tax benefits because tax rates and their applicability vary by region and jurisdiction.

For construction-related purchases, tax benefits would be dependent on construction spending levels and the ability of local businesses to meet the demand for required materials and services.

For employee-generated purchases, tax revenues would depend on the proportion of the workforce that is local, the behavior of individual workers, and the duration of their stay. Some portion of the construction payroll would be retained and spent within the region of influence by the construction workforce over the construction period. The resulting tax revenues generated by this spending represent additional fiscal benefits of the Project.

Short-term fiscal benefits may also arise from fees assessed by federal agencies for the use of public land for pipeline and electrical transmission line or distribution line ROWs, as well as from local, state, and federal income taxes paid by corporations and employees serving the Project. These taxes and fees vary by region and have not been quantified for this analysis.

Public Services

Various types of emergency events may occur during construction, such as worker accidents requiring medical attention. As a result, the proposed Project could temporarily increase the demand for emergency response, medical, police, and fire protection services during the construction period. Table 3.10.1-10 lists the public service providers located in the region of influence. Emergency response in more urban areas likely would be quick, based on the proximity of public service facilities to the pipeline. However, in more rural sections of the proposed route, particularly Montana, South Dakota and Nebraska, emergency response times may be long based on communication, dispatch, and travel time constraints. It is the intent of Keystone to work with local law enforcement, fire departments, and emergency services providers, including medical aid facilities, to establish appropriate measures that would ensure effective emergency response and provision of related services; this information would be included in the ERP developed as part of the Project. With implementation of applicable measures in the ERP, construction-related impacts on public services are expected to be minor.

The influx of construction workers in local communities also has the potential to generate additional demands on local public services. The magnitude of public service impacts would vary by community, depending on the size of the non-local workforce and their accompanying families, the size of the community, and duration of stay. However, as noted above, few non-local workers are expected to be accompanied by family members because of the short construction period and transient nature of the work. Therefore, potential public service impacts associated with temporary increases in population would be short term and minor in much of the proposed Project area. The effect could be greater in areas with few small towns and fewer services.

Property Damages and Values

Any potential damages to private property during Project construction would be concentrated along the ROW and appurtenant facilities and would be localized. Keystone would compensate property owners for any damages caused by Project construction. Land disturbed by the Project would be restored to the extent practicable. Keystone would repair or restore drain tiles, fences, and land productivity if these are damaged or adversely affected during construction. Project construction activities would not likely create long term adverse impacts to property values.

Environmental Justice

The Project would not be expected to result in adverse impacts that would fall disproportionately on minority or low-income populations located along the Project route. Construction dust and noise is restricted to the brief construction period along each segment of the proposed Project route and impacts diminish once construction activities end. These impacts are spread equally among counties with minority populations meaningfully greater than the state total and/or a meaningfully greater percent of individuals living below poverty. No group is greater than 50 percent of the state average. Table 3.10.2-3 provides a list of the counties within the Project area and specifies: 1) whether a construction facility (a pipe yard (PY), a construction camp (CY), or a contractors camp (CC)) is planned to be located within that county; 2) whether there is at least one minority population meaningfully greater than the overall state minority population in that county; and 3) whether the number of individuals living below the poverty line in that county is meaningfully greater than the state average. Construction facilities are planned in 32 counties within the Project area and eight of those counties have meaningfully greater environmental justice statistics (25 percent). Of the 59 counties along the Project corridor, 20 counties have meaningfully greater environmental justice statistics (34 percent)

County	Construction Facility	Statistic Meaningfully Greater than Respective State (2000)	
		Minority Population	Poverty Line (2007)
Montana			
Phillips	PY	No	No
Valley	PY, CC and 2 CY	Yes	No
McCone	2 PY, 1 CC, 1 CY	No	No
Dawson	2 PY, 1 CY	No	No
Prairie	No	No	No
Fallon	2 PY	No	No
South Dakota			
Harding	3 PY, 1 CY	No	No
Butte	No	Yes	No
Perkins	No	No	No
Meade	2 PY, 1 CY	Yes	No
Pennington	No	Yes	No
Haakon	2 PY, 1 CY	No	No
Jones	2 PY, 1 CY	No	No

**TABLE 3.10.2-3
Location of Construction Facilities Relative to Environmental Justice Statistics**

County	Construction Facility	Statistic Meaningfully Greater than Respective State (2000)	
		Minority Population	Poverty Line (2007)
Lyman	No	Yes	Yes
Tripp	2 PY, 1 CC	No	No
Nebraska			
Keya Paha	1 PY	No	No
Rock	No	No	Yes
Holt	1 PY, 2 CY	No	No
Garfield	No	No	No
Wheeler	1 PY	No	No
Greeley	1 PY, 1 CC	No	No
Boone	No	No	No
Nance	1 PY	No	No
Merrick	1 CC	No	No
Hamilton	1 PY	No	No
York	1 CC	No	No
Fillmore	1 PY	No	No
Saline	No	No	No
Jefferson	2 PY, 1 CC	No	No
Pump Stations – Kansas			
Clay	No	No	No
Butler	No	No	No
Oklahoma			
Atoka	No	No	No
Bryan	No	Yes	No
Coal	No	Yes	Yes
Creek	No	No	No
Hughes	1 CY	Yes	Yes
Lincoln	1 PY	No	No
Okfuskee	No	Yes	No
Payne	No	Yes	No
Seminole	No	Yes	No
Pontotoc	No	Yes	No
Texas			
Angelina	2 CY	Yes	No
Cherokee	No	No	No
Delta	No	No	No
Fannin	No	No	No

TABLE 3.10.2-3 Location of Construction Facilities Relative to Environmental Justice Statistics			
County	Construction Facility	Statistic Meaningfully Greater than Respective State (2000)	
		Minority Population	Poverty Line (2007)
Franklin	1 RRS/PY	No	No
Hardin	1 RRS/PY	No	No
Hopkins	No	No	No
Jefferson	2 PY, 1 CY	Yes	No
Lamar	A PY, 2 CY, 1RRS/PY	Yes	No
Liberty	1 CY	No	No
Nacogdoches	1 CY	No	No
Polk	2 PY	Yes	No
Rusk	1 CY	Yes	No
Smith	1 PY	No	No
Upshur	No	No	No
Wood	No	No	No
Texas			
Chambers	No	Yes	No
Harris	No	Yes	No

Abbreviations: Pipe Yard (PY), Construction Camp (CC) and Contractor Yards (CY) Railroad Siding and or a Pipe Yard (RRS/PY).

Traffic and Transportation

Keystone would utilize public and existing private roads to access most of the construction ROW. Keystone would implement construction, mitigation, and reclamation actions presented in the Project CMR Plan (Appendix B) except where those actions would conflict with any federal, state, or local rules and regulations or other permits or approvals. It is unlikely that any improvement or maintenance would be required for paved roads before or during construction, while some gravel and dirt roads could require maintenance. Keystone would ensure that construction across paved roads, highways, and rail routes would concur with the requirements stipulated in the road and railroad crossing permits and approvals it obtains prior to construction. Generally, all roads and railroads would be traversed by borings that would involve excavation of a pit on each side of the roadway, placing required equipment into the pits, and boring a hole with a diameter large as the pipeline itself.

Construction activities could result in short-term impacts to traffic and transportation infrastructure. Traffic volumes along roads proximate to the pipeline route could increase with movements of construction-related employees, equipment, and materials. Bored roadway crossings would reduce or eliminate the need for road closures, although temporary road closures could be required in some cases. However, impacts to local traffic would be minor and temporary.

Keystone would use open-cut methods, where permitted by local authorities and private owners, to traverse mostly smaller unpaved roads and driveways. This method would require temporary closure of the feature to traffic and use of detours. If such detours are not feasible, Keystone would keep at least one lane of traffic open other than when it would be necessary to close the road completely to install the pipeline. In general, open-cut road crossings would be finished and the subject roads resurfaced within

two days. At each such crossing, Keystone would post signs and utilize other measures as required by federal, state, and local transportation agencies to minimize traffic disturbances and ensure safety.

3.10.2.2 Operations Impacts

Population

The limited number of permanent employees associated with the Project would result in negligible long-term impacts on public services.

Housing

The limited number of permanent employees associated with the Project would result in negligible long-term impacts on housing.

Local Economic Activity

During operation, the proposed Project would generate a demand for goods and services, including power, which would result in economic benefits to the region.

Tax Revenue and Fiscal Resources

Once the Project is constructed, it would generate long-term property tax revenues for the states and counties traversed by the pipeline, in accordance with applicable tax structures. Keystone has developed estimates of property taxes by state based on the value and/or length of pipe in the ground and quantity of aboveground facilities (see Table 3.10.2-3). The estimated tax data for Montana was developed by the Montana Department of Revenue (e-mail correspondence with Vern Fogle). Keystone estimates that \$138.4 million in annual property tax revenues would be generated by the Project in the region of influence. This estimate is based on 2006 tax rates and an estimated \$7.0 billion of capital costs. The estimate implies an average 2.0 percent effective tax rate on \$7.0 billion. Most of these revenues, about \$98.2 million, are attributed to the Steele City Segment. The Pump Stations in Kansas would generate \$2.0 million. The Gulf Coast Segment would generate \$37.3 million. The remaining \$1.1 million would be generated on the Houston Lateral.

The incremental property tax revenues for the Project area would be an increase of 9.0 percent over the 2006 taxes reported by each State as levied in the counties within the proposed Project area. The greatest percent increase over 2006 taxes, 42.0 percent, would occur along the Steele City Segment. Keystone estimates that in Montana the increase over 2006 taxes would be 145.9 percent. The Keystone estimate implies an effective tax rate of 4.3 percent on the estimated capital costs. This tax rate is twice that of the Project average and may cause an overstatement of the taxes that would be paid to Montana counties. Without regard to magnitude, the impact of the property taxes is a benefit to the counties. The percent increase of taxes over 2006 levels in Kansas is 2.7 percent. Along the Gulf Coast Segment the Project property taxes represent an 11.9 percent increase over 2006 levels. The increase in property taxes along the Houston Lateral is 2.1 percent above 2006 levels. Local counties would be the primary beneficiaries of estimated property tax benefits. Given the size of the existing tax base of affected jurisdictions and assuming that the 2006 tax rates would remain in effect once the Project is built, these revenues represent a minor to major long-term Project fiscal benefit.

**TABLE 3.10.2-3
2006 Tax Levy and Estimated Project Property Tax by County**

County	Taxes Levied (\$)	Property Taxes	Percent of 2007 Taxes Levied
Steele City Segment			
Montana			
Phillips	6,891,579	4,367,060	63.37%
Valley	12,731,805	14,860,604	116.72%
McCone	3,161,702	18,038,389	570.53%
Dawson	12,141,019	14,126,149	116.35%
Prairie	2,106,988	5,869,630	278.58%
Fallon	4,663,545	5,695,963	122.14%
<i>Subtotal Montana</i>	<i>41,696,638</i>	<i>62,957,795</i>	<i>150.99%</i>
South Dakota			
Harding	876,254	3,346,244	381.88%
Butte	1,811,097	134,730	7.44%
Perkins	1,290,869	624,306	48.36%
Meade	6,773,987	2,608,096	38.50%
Pennington	25,958,625	41,365	0.16%
Haakon	825,951	2,818,539	341.25%
Jones	612,854	2,044,666	333.63%
Lyman	1,057,054	489,057	46.27%
Tripp	2,197,509	3,298,393	150.10%
<i>Subtotal South Dakota</i>	<i>41,404,200</i>	<i>15,405,396</i>	<i>37.21%</i>
Nebraska			
Keya Paha	2,429,603	1,133,796	46.67%
Rock	4,031,120	649,588	16.11%
Holt	19,720,255	3,548,059	17.99%
Garfield	2,613,263	659,714	25.24%
Wheeler	2,699,567	1,328,431	49.21%
Greeley	5,144,809	1,714,863	33.33%
Boone	11,109,437	222,867	2.01%
Nance	6,195,427	1,280,136	20.66%
Merrick	12,327,924	1,581,338	12.83%
Hamilton	16,950,108	499,036	2.94%
York	22,800,935	2,175,921	9.54%
Fillmore	13,129,028	1,577,037	12.01%
Saline	19,624,429	1,339,885	6.83%
Jefferson	13,079,964	4,184,344	31.99%
<i>Subtotal Nebraska</i>	<i>151,855,869</i>	<i>21,895,015</i>	<i>14.42%</i>
Pump Stations - Kansas			
Clay	9,037,940	1,542,806	17.07%
Butler	65,068,063	453,949	0.70%
<i>Subtotal Kansas</i>	<i>74,106,003</i>	<i>1,996,755</i>	<i>2.69%</i>

**TABLE 3.10.2-3
2006 Tax Levy and Estimated Project Property Tax by County**

County	Taxes Levied (\$)	Property Taxes	Percent of 2007 Taxes Levied
Gulf Coast Segment			
Oklahoma			
Lincoln	2,311,059	1,620,262	70.11%
Creek	31,369,794	411,919	1.31%
Okfuskee	3,409,877	1,239,748	36.36%
Seminole	9,064,881	2,169,785	23.94%
Hughes	6,340,078	2,188,917	34.53%
Coal	3,733,358	2,604,589	69.77%
Atoka	4,059,497	1,568,644	38.64%
Bryan	15,568,464	2,494,487	16.02%
<i>Subtotal Oklahoma</i>	<i>75,857,008</i>	<i>14,298,351</i>	<i>18.85%</i>
Texas			
Fannin	6,861,098	415,734	6.06%
Lamar	9,288,471	1,514,314	16.30%
Delta	1,457,836	1,550,784	106.38%
Hopkins	7,451,377	573,610	7.70%
Franklin	3,831,662	1,098,306	28.66%
Wood	10,396,712	1,863,930	17.93%
Upshur	8,345,374	348,966	4.18%
Smith	30,868,384	1,645,008	5.33%
Cherokee	10,459,552	1,393,088	13.32%
Rusk	13,641,514	646,068	4.74%
Nacogdoches	10,942,646	1,139,530	10.41%
Angelina	12,421,410	1,470,148	11.84%
Polk	12,316,738	3,015,148	24.48%
Hardin	10,863,453	593,311	5.46%
Liberty	21,705,512	4,156,875	19.15%
Jefferson	66,382,570	1,618,688	2.44%
<i>Subtotal Texas (Gulf Coast Segment)</i>	<i>237,234,309</i>	<i>23,043,508</i>	<i>9.71%</i>
Houston Lateral			
Texas			
Liberty	see above	see above	see above
Chambers	26,053,006	207,106	0.79%
Harris	885,849,380	667,702	0.08%
<i>Subtotal Texas (Houston Lateral)</i>	<i>911,902,386</i>	<i>874,808</i>	<i>0.10%</i>
<i>Subtotal Texas</i>	<i>1,149,136,695</i>	<i>23,918,316</i>	<i>2.08%</i>

Source: Keystone 2009 from the following:

South Dakota, Equalized Valuations and Property Taxes Collected from All Sources,
<http://www.state.sd.gov/applications/DLASearches/countymenu.aspx>

Nebraska Dept of Revenue Property Assessment Division 2007 and 2008 Comparison, December 2008.
<http://pat.ne.gov/researchReports/annual/pdf/2006/NE%20PA&T%20Annrpt2006%20part%201%20of%204%20Text%20&%20Tables%201-18.pdf.html>

Kansas <http://www.ksrevenue.org/pdf/forms/07arcomplete.pdf>

Oklahoma, Personal communication with county assessors and treasures.

Texas taxes by County <http://www.window.state.tx.us/taxinfo/proptax/annual06/table18.pdf>.

Public Services

Decline in public service levels would be negligible in most areas of the proposed Project. In remote areas, the need for public services would be somewhat ameliorated by construction of the work camps. No existing public service facility expansions are would be required based on current Project projections.

Environmental Justice

The proposed Project would result in negligible to minor and temporary adverse effects on certain socioeconomic resources in the region, such as housing availability and public services. Conversely, Project-related spending and tax revenues would result in economic benefits in the region of influence, which may in turn positively affect low-income and minority populations through increased employment opportunities (and income benefits) and improved public service levels.

The public review and comment process that DOS has implemented in association with the environmental review under NEPA has or will provide multiple opportunities in multiple formats for public input. Keystone has communicated directly with the property owners who would be affected by the proposed Project, irrespective of minority or income status, regarding the proposed route and the results of archaeological and environmental surveys of their property.

As a result of the stringent safety and integrity measures Keystone has incorporated into the design, construction, and operation of the Project, as well as governing PHMSA pipeline safety regulations, the Project does not appear to pose a significant risk to residents along the route, whether in rural or urban areas. Further, there is no evidence that such risks would be disproportionately borne by any minority or low-income populations identified within potentially affected communities in proximity to the Project. Section 3.13 addresses the risks and associated impacts to public health and safety that would result from a pipeline crude oil release and also describes how applicable safety regulations and standards would minimize the potential risk of such releases.

In summary, the Project is not expected to result in any adverse environmental justice impacts to minority or low-income populations in the region of influence. These populations may benefit from the positive socioeconomic effects of the Project.

Traffic and Transportation

Keystone would primarily utilize underground boring methods to cross under roads and railroads. Impacts to local traffic would be minor and would occur only during the construction period. No substantive ongoing impacts to roads and railroads from operation and maintenance of the pipeline would be expected. Such activities could require occasional use of roads to access the pipeline site with much less equipment and personnel than would occur during construction.

3.10.3 Connected Actions

3.10.3.1 Power Distribution Lines and Substations

Construction of the substations, transformers and necessary electrical power distribution lines would impact local economies by creating temporary employment, and potentially through the purchase of goods and services, and taxes on those goods. The magnitude of the positive economic impact is not known at the time this report is being written as the estimate of construction costs for the substations, transformers and electrical power distribution lines from the various local power providers is not yet available. The economic impact would be distributed throughout the Project area. Table 3.10.3-1 shows the geographic distribution of the planned improvements to power infrastructure as a proxy for estimating the geographic distribution of the economic impact. In general relatively more transformers and miles of electrical power distribution lines would be required for the Steele City Segment. Also included in Table 3.10.3-1 are the number and names of the local power providers.

TABLE 3.10.3-1 Summary of Power Supply Requirements for Pump Stations and Tank Farm					
Segment	State	Number of Transformers	Miles of Power Distribution lines	Number of Power Providers	Power Provider
Steele City Segment	Montana	6	147.4	5	Big Flat Electric Cooperative, McCone Electric Cooperative, Norval Electric Cooperative, Tongue River Electric Cooperative, Montana-Dakota Utilities Company
Steele City Segment	South Dakota	7	161.8	3	Grand Electric Cooperative, West Central Electric Cooperative, Rosebud Electric Cooperative
Steele City Segment	Nebraska	5	68.1	1	Nebraska Public Power District
Keystone Cushing Extension	Kansas	2	21.4	2	Clay Center Public Utility, Westar Energy
Gulf Coast Segment	Oklahoma	4	16.9	4	Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company, Canadian Valley Electric Cooperative/PSO, People's Electric Cooperative/PSO, Southeastern Electric Cooperative
Gulf Coast Segment	Texas	6	13.5	4	Lamar Electric Cooperative, Wood County Electric Cooperative, Cherokee County Electric Cooperative, Sam Houston Electric Cooperative

Source: Keystone 2009c.

3.10.3.2 Lower Brule to Witten 230-kV Transmission Line

Construction of the 230-kV transmission line (originating from the Fort Thompson/Big Bend area and running south to the existing Witten Substation), the new Lower Brule Substation and expansion of the Witten Substation would impact local economies by creating temporary employment, and potentially through the purchase of goods and services, and taxes on those goods. The magnitude of the positive

economic impact is not known at the time this report is being written as the estimate of construction costs for this connected action is not yet known. The economic impact would likely be concentrated in Lyman and Tripp counties in south-central South Dakota, the location of the Big Bend Dam and the Witten Substation. The currently proposed alternative alignments for the Lower Brule to Witten 230-kV Transmission Line cross the Lower Brule Indian Reservation. Future assessments of the socioeconomic impacts of this connected action will include an analysis of Environmental Justice.

3.10.4 References

American Hospital Directory. 2006. Information on Hospital Facilities in the Project Area. Available online at: <<http://www.ahd.com/>>.

Capitol Impact. 2006. Various information and data regarding public service providers in the project area, including law enforcement and fire protection. Available online at: <<http://www.capitolimpact.com/>>.

Delorme Gazetteers, various years, various geographic locations.

Fogle, Vern, Economist, Montana Department of Revenue, e-mail correspondence, November 24, 2009.

Kansas <http://www.ksrevenue.org/pdf/forms/08arcomplete.pdf>

Keystone (TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP). 2008. Keystone XL Project Environmental Report (ER). November 2008. Document No. 10623-006. Submitted to the U.S. Department of State and the Bureau of Land Management by Keystone.

Keystone. 2009a. Response to United States Department of State Data Request 1.0. May 1, 2009. Submitted to U.S. Department of State by TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P.

Keystone. 2009b. Response to United States Department of State Data Request 2.0. June 25, 2009. Submitted to U.S. Department of State by TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P.

Keystone. 2009c. Supplemental Filing to ER. July 6, 2009. Document No.: 10623-006. Submitted to U.S. Department of State and Bureau of Land Management by TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P.

Nebraska Dept of Revenue Property Assessment Division 2007 and 2008 Comparison, December 2008. <http://pat.ne.gov/researchReports/map/index.html>. Montana State.

Oklahoma, Personal communication with Teresa Strawther, Ad Valorem Division, Oklahoma Tax Commission, July 27, 2009.

Poverty info <http://www.census.gov/did/www/saibe/data/statecounty/index.html>

South Dakota, Equalized Valuations and Property Taxes Collected from All Sources, <http://www.state.sd.us/drr2/prospectax/property/publications.htm>

Texas taxes by County <http://www.window.state.tx.us/taxinfo/proptax/07taxrates/>. Includes County, School and Special District Taxes on the County Valuation.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2000. 2000 Census. Various demographic data, including population, housing, and race-ethnicity. Available online at: <<http://censtats.census.gov/usa/usa.shtml>>. Accessed in 2009.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2006. USA Counties. Various demographic data. Available online at: <<http://censtats.census.gov/usa/usa.shtml>>. Accessed in 2009.

U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic Accounts, Local Area Personal Income, Table CA1-3: Per capita personal income, <http://bea.gov/regional/reis/>.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. <http://www.bls.gov/lau/#tables>. Accessed in 2009.

US Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service (ERS) Median household income and unemployment ERS, <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Data/Unemployment/>. Assessed in 2009.

Hotel and motel rooms were found using www.travelpost.com/hotels.aspx, www.aacolorado.com/travel/, www.tripadvisor.com/