

**Trailblazer Pipeline Company, LLC
and
Rockies Express Pipeline LLC**



Trailblazer Pipeline Company LLC



Trailblazer Conversion Project

Volume 1

Resource Report 5

Socioeconomics

Public Information

TRAILBLAZER CONVERSION PROJECT

RESOURCE REPORT 5 SOCIOECONOMICS

FERC DOCKET NO. CP22-_____

Prepared for



Trailblazer Pipeline Company, LLC
and
Rockies Express Pipeline LLC
370 Van Gordon Street
Lakewood, CO 80228

Prepared by



Kleinfelder, Inc.
707 17th Street, Suite 3000
Denver, Colorado 80202

May 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Resource Report 5	Socioeconomics	5-1
	5.1 Population, Economy, and Employment.....	5-4
	5.1.1 Existing Population	5-4
	5.1.2 Existing Economy and Employment Conditions	5-5
	5.1.3 Construction Operation Impacts and Mitigation	5-8
	5.2 Housing	5-9
	5.2.1 Existing Housing Conditions	5-9
	5.2.2 Temporary Housing Conditions	5-10
	5.2.3 Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation	5-11
	5.3 Public Services and Facilities	5-12
	5.3.1 Existing Public Services and Facilities.....	5-12
	5.3.2 Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation	5-13
	5.4 Transportation	5-15
	5.4.1 Existing Conditions	5-15
	5.4.2 Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation	5-15
	5.5 Property Values.....	5-16
	5.6 Displacement of Residences or Business	5-17
	5.7 Construction Payroll, Materials Purchase, and Tax Revenues	5-17
	5.8 Environmental Justice	5-18
	5.9 References	5-27

List of Tables

Table 5-1	Population Characteristics in Project and Blanket Authorization Facilities Areas
Table 5-2	Socioeconomic Conditions of the Project and Blanket Authorization Facilities Areas
Table 5-3	Existing Housing Conditions in the Project and Blanket Authorization Facilities Areas
Table 5-4	Existing Temporary Housing Conditions in Project and Blanket Authorization Facilities Areas
Table 5-5	Existing Public Services and Facilities in Project and Blanket Authorization Facilities Areas (2021)
Table 5-6	Population, Race, and Poverty Statistics in Project Abandonment Areas
Table 5-7	Population, Race, and Poverty Statistics in Project and Blanket Authorization Facilities Areas

RESOURCE REPORT 5**Socioeconomics**

FERC Minimum Filing Requirement Checklist Resource Report No. 5 Socioeconomics		
Filing Requirement	Location in Report	Comment
<input type="checkbox"/> For major aboveground facilities and major pipeline projects that require an EIS, describe existing socioeconomic conditions within the project area - Title 18 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part (§)380.12(g)(1)	Not Applicable	This project does not require an EIS, however, this information is provided in Sections 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.2.1, and 5.2.2.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For major aboveground facilities, quantify impact on employment, housing, local government services, local tax revenues, transportation, and other relevant factors within the project area – 18 CFR § 380.12(g)(2- 6)	Sections 5.1.3, 5.2.3, 5.3.2, 5.4.2, and 5.7	
Information Often Missing and Resulting in Data Requests	Location in Report	Comment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluate the impact of any substantial immigration of people on governmental facilities and services and describe plans to reduce the impact on local infrastructure.	Section 5.3.2	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Describe on-site work force requirements, including the number of construction personnel who currently reside within the impact area, would commute daily to the site from outside the impact area, or would relocate temporarily within the impact area.	Section 5.1.3	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimate total worker payroll and material purchases during construction and operation.	Section 5.7	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Estimate project-related ad valorem and local tax revenues.	Section 5.7	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Determine whether existing housing within the project area is sufficient to meet the needs of the additional population.	Section 5.2	

RESOURCE REPORT 5**Socioeconomics**

FERC Minimum Filing Requirement Checklist Resource Report No. 5 Socioeconomics		
Filing Requirement	Location in Report	Comment
<input type="checkbox"/> Describe the number and types of residences and businesses that would be displaced by the project, procedures to be used to acquire these properties, and types and amounts of relocation assistance payments.	Not Applicable	No businesses or residences would be removed or displaced by construction and operation of the Project's facilities as stated in Section 5.6.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conduct a fiscal impact analysis evaluating incremental local government expenditures in relation to incremental local government revenues that would result from construction of the project. Incremental expenditures include, but are not limited to, school operating costs, road maintenance and repair, public safety, and public utility costs.	Section 5.7	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Describe impacts on local traffic due to construction- and operation-related traffic and worker commuting. Address impacts on marine traffic where applicable (e.g., LNG import/export facilities).	Section 5.4	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evaluate the effects of the project on minority and low-income populations in consideration of Executive Order 12898.	Section 5.8	

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

As described in Resource Report 1, Trailblazer Pipeline Company (TPC) is seeking authorization from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) to abandon certain natural gas pipeline facilities and associated compressor stations (together the TPC Pipeline Facilities). Rockies Express Pipeline (REX) is seeking authorization from FERC pursuant to Sections 7(b) and 7(c) of the NGA to: (1) abandon capacity on the Rockies Express Pipeline (REX Pipeline) to TPC by lease and (2) construct, install, own, operate, and maintain certain facilities necessary to support the lease service. Together, TPC and REX are the “Applicants,” and their collective efforts constitute the Trailblazer Conversion Project (Project).

The Project includes two new pipeline laterals and appurtenances, meter and regulating stations, and new compressor stations. Specifically, the Project involves:

1. Abandonment by TPC of 392-miles of the Trailblazer Pipeline; cut and cap 11 interconnects on the abandoned portion of the Trailblazer pipeline; and cut and cap each end of the abandoned pipeline to isolate the portions of pipe remaining in natural gas service from the portion being abandoned.
2. Abandonment by TPC of three mainline compressor stations.
3. Construction by REX of two new lateral pipeline segments of various diameter in Nebraska totaling approximately 41.0 miles. The REX Lateral to TPC Adams (18.8 miles of 20-inch-diameter pipeline) and the REX Lateral to TPC East (22.2 miles of 36-inch-diameter pipeline).
4. Construction by REX of five new interconnect booster compressor stations at existing Trailblazer Pipeline facilities.
5. Install station piping and additional regulation at three existing Trailblazer Pipeline meter stations to enable deliveries into end users or interstate pipeline systems.
6. Expansion of one existing meter station between REX Pipeline and Trailblazer Pipeline.
7. Construction of two new REX meter stations.

In addition to the facilities to be abandoned by TPC and constructed by REX under 7(b) and 7(c), respectively, within this Application, Tallgrass Interstate Gas Transmission, LLC (TIGT) and TPC will construct additional facilities under their respective Blanket Authorizations. These facilities are related to the work being proposed in this Application and are considered indirect impacts of the proposed Project.

The following socioeconomic analysis focuses on Weld, Logan, and Sedgwick Counties, Colorado and Kimball, Franklin, Webster, Jefferson, Perkins, Lincoln, Kearney, Fillmore, Adams, and Saline Counties, Nebraska, where Project facilities are located, as well as the communities located in proximity to the Project areas. Additionally, the

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

socioeconomic analysis covers the Blanket Authorization facilities located in Logan County, Colorado and Fillmore, Kearney, and Saline Counties, Nebraska. See Figure 1-1 located in Resource Report 1 for a complete map of the Project facilities and Blanket Authorization facilities.

5.1 POPULATION, ECONOMY, AND EMPLOYMENT

The U.S. Census Bureau provides three types of data which have been used in the socioeconomic evaluation, decennial data, American Community Survey (ACS) 1-year data, and ACS 5-year data. ACS 1-year data is an ongoing survey that provides data ever year. This data provides a broad range of topics about social, economic, demographic, and housing characteristics of the U.S. population. The ACS 5-year estimates are from a “period” that represent data collected over a period of time. The primary advantage of using multiyear estimates is the increased statistical reliability of the data for less populated area and small population subgroups.

As the 2020 decennial census data has not been released at the time of this analysis, the data used for the majority of the socioeconomic evaluation are the ACS 5-year estimates. The 2015-2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates are based on data collected between 2015 and 2019, as well as the information collected in the 2010 decennial census, and represents average population, employment, and housing characteristics during that period. The second data set used in this evaluation is ACS 1-year population estimate for 2021 for the states, counties, and communities in the Project area.

5.1.1 Existing Population

The proposed Project consists of the abandonment of the existing Trailblazer pipeline, three associated compressor stations, and one interconnect; as well as the construction, installation, and modification of various natural gas pipeline facilities located in Weld, Logan, and Sedgwick Counties, Colorado and Kimball, Franklin, Webster, Jefferson, Perkins, Lincoln, Kearney, Adams, and Saline Counties, Nebraska. There are additional Blanket Authorization facilities located in Logan County, Colorado and Kearney, Fillmore, and Saline Counties, Nebraska.

In 2019, Colorado’s population was 5,610,349, and was estimated at 5,758,736 in 2021, indicating a 2.5 percent growth over 2 years. In 2019 Nebraska’s population was 1,934,408 and was estimated at 1,961,504 in 2021, indicating a 1.4 percent growth over 2 years.

The surrounding land use for the Project include agricultural and rangeland as well as rural dwellings and smaller population areas. Hastings, Nebraska is the largest population center near the Project area, is located to the north of the proposed REX Lateral to TPC Adams lateral pipeline. The population density per square mile for the

RESOURCE REPORT 5**Socioeconomics**

counties that the Project facilities will be constructed in is generally in line with the population density of their respective states, with the exception of Weld County which is 81.4 compared to the density for the State of Colorado which is 55.6 and Adams County which is 56.2 compared to the density for the State of Nebraska which is 25.1. (For a comparison marker, the population density inside a large U.S. city is about 1600 people per square mile.)

Table 5-1 summarizes the population characteristics of the Project and Blanket Authorization facilities areas.

**Table 5-1
Population Characteristics in the Project and Blanket Authorization Facilities Areas**

County/Nearby Cities	2015-2019 Population^a	2019 Population Density (Persons/Square Mile)^b	2021 Estimated Population^c
Colorado			
State of Colorado	5,610,349	55.6	5,773,714
Weld County	324,492	81.4	328,981
Logan County	22,409	12.1	22,380
Sedgwick County	2,248	4.1	2,322
Nebraska			
State of Nebraska	1,934,408	25.1	1,961,504
Kimball County	3,632	3.8	3,633
Franklin County	2,979	5.1	2,987
Webster County	3,487	6.1	3,537
Jefferson County	7,046	12.3	7,144
Perkins County	2,891	3.3	2,901
Lincoln County	34,914	13.6	35,263
Kearney County	6,495	12.6	6,529
Adams County	31,636	56.2	31,587
Clay County	6,203	10.8	6,104
Fillmore County	5,547	9.6	5,551
Saline County	14,224	24.8	14,270

^a U.S. Census Bureau, Table S0101 Age and Sex, 2015-2019 ACS Survey 5-Year Estimates

^b Population density calculated based on U.S. Census Bureau provided population and geographic square mileage.

^c U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts, Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for the United States, Regions, States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico: April 1, 2020, to July 1, 2021

5.1.2 Existing Economy and Employment Conditions

Current economic and employment conditions in Weld, Logan, and Sedgwick Counties, Colorado and Kimball, Franklin, Webster, Jefferson, Perkins, Lincoln, Kearney, Fillmore, Adams, and Saline Counties, Nebraska are presented in Table 5-2 below. The 2015-2019 estimated per capita income for Weld County, Colorado was lower than the average per capita income for the State of Colorado. The 2015-2019 estimated per

RESOURCE REPORT 5**Socioeconomics**

capita incomes for Logan and Sedgwick counties were significantly lower than the State of Colorado. The estimated 2015-2019 per capita incomes for Kimball, Franklin, Webster, Jefferson, Lincoln, Kearney, Adams Counties, Nebraska were all lower than the estimated 2015-2019 State of Nebraska per capita income. Saline County, Nebraska has a significantly lower per capita income than the State of Nebraska, while Perkins County, Nebraska had a higher per capita income than the State of Nebraska.

Employment in the areas near the proposed Project is predominately in educational services, health care, and social assistance, typically followed by agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting or mining or else by construction and manufacturing services. Unemployment rates in Weld and Logan counties matched, or were slightly lower than, the Colorado statewide unemployment rate. Sedgwick County had an unemployment rate almost double that of the Colorado statewide unemployment rate. Nearby communities Crook and Julesburg, Colorado had an unemployment rate that was significantly higher than the Colorado statewide unemployment rate. Unemployment rates in Franklin, Webster, Jefferson, Perkins, Lincoln, Kearny, and Adams Counties were lower than the Nebraska statewide unemployment rates. Kimball County, Nebraska had an unemployment rate significantly higher than the Nebraska statewide unemployment rate. Unemployment rates in the nearby communities of Strang, Steele City, and Bushnell Nebraska were significantly higher than the Nebraska statewide unemployment rates. Average per capita incomes for the Project and Blanket Authorization facility counties and nearby communities were all slightly lower, but generally in line with the average per capita incomes for the States of Colorado and Nebraska.

Table 5-2
Socioeconomic Conditions of the Project and Blanket Authorization Facilities Areas

State/County	Average Per Capita Income (U.S. Dollars) 2015-2019 ^a	Total Civilian Labor Force (Persons) 2015-2019 ^b	Unemployment Rate (percent) 2015-2019 ^b	2015-2019 Major Employment by Industry (Percent) ^c
Colorado				
State of Colorado	\$38,226	4,645,780	3.7	Educational services, and health care and social assistance (21.8)
Weld County	\$33,863	248,474	3.7	Educational services, and health care and social assistance (19.5)
Logan County	\$26,727	18,279	3.3	Educational services, and health care and social assistance (23.3)
Sedgwick County	\$27,527	1,795	7.0	Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting, and Mining (21.2)

RESOURCE REPORT 5**Socioeconomics**

Table 5-2
Socioeconomic Conditions of the Project and Blanket Authorization Facilities Areas

State/County	Average Per Capita Income (U.S. Dollars) 2015-2019 ^a	Total Civilian Labor Force (Persons) 2015-2019 ^b	Unemployment Rate (percent) 2015-2019 ^b	2015-2019 Major Employment by Industry (Percent) ^c
Nebraska				
State of Nebraska	\$33,272	1,509,290	3.3	Educational services, and health care and social assistance (25.0)
Kimball County	\$27,478	2,944	5.9	Educational services, and health care and social assistance (18.8)
Franklin County	\$28,365	2,503	0.7	Educational services, and health care and social assistance (21.1)
Webster County	\$29,969	2,783	2.1	Educational services, and health care and social assistance (26.7)
Jefferson County	\$27,461	5,733	1.7	Educational services, and health care and social assistance (19.3)
Perkins County	\$35,990	2,245	1.4	Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting, and Mining (22.2)
Lincoln County	\$31,567	27,833	3.2	Educational services, and health care and social assistance (24.7)
Kearney County	\$31,094	5,075	2.8	Educational services, and health care and social assistance (26.9)
Adams County	\$28,729	24,968	2.5	Educational services, and health care and social assistance (26.3)
Clay County	\$27,539	4,857	3.5	Educational services, and health care and social assistance (25.0)
Fillmore County	\$34,483	4,579	1.9	Educational services, and health care and social assistance (22.8)
Saline County	\$24,627	11,087	3.9	Educational services, and health care and social assistance (25.6)

^a U.S. Census Bureau, Table S1902 Mean Income in the Past 12 Months, 2015-2019 5-Year ACS Survey Estimates

^b U.S. Census Bureau, Table S2301 Employment Status, 2015-2019 5-Year ACS Survey Estimates

^c U.S. Census Bureau, Table S2404 Industry by Sex for the Full-Time, Year-Round Civilian Employed Population 16 Years and Over, 2015-2019 5-Year ACS Survey Estimates

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

5.1.3 Construction Operation Impacts and Mitigation

While there may be impacts on the existing socioeconomic environment of the proposed Project area, the construction required for the new facilities would be relatively short-term and therefore impacts to the socioeconomics of the Project area would be mostly minor.

The bulk of the socioeconomic impacts would be short-term and would arise primarily due to the temporary influx of employees and traffic during the construction of the new aboveground facilities for compression, metering, and regulating and ancillary facilities as well as the two new laterals. Because of the relatively short duration of the construction periods (the entire Project construction is estimated at approximately 9 months) for the Project and based on the expectation that approximately 50 percent of the construction workforce will be drawn from local populations, population effects are expected to be minor. There would be slightly increased local economic activity in the hospitality and transportation sectors due to construction activity. Since this employment would occur over a period of approximately 9 months, the population effects are anticipated to be minimal when viewed statewide in Colorado and Nebraska and associated counties and communities. No permanent decrease in the unemployment rate is expected to result from the construction of the Project or the Blanket Authorization facilities.

Construction activities for the Project are scheduled to begin in January 2023. A peak crew of approximately 1,260 people would be required for the abandonment and construction of the entire Project. This peak work force would be broken down into the following groups:

- Aboveground facilities for compression, metering, and regulating – 510 workers
- Proposed laterals and ancillary facilities – 750 workers

All construction would happen simultaneously at the Project sites, accordingly, a peak construction workforce would number 1,260 people for the entire Project. The Project is scheduled to achieve commercial operation no later than December 15, 2023. The construction timeframe and workforce for the Blanket Authorization facilities would be similar to those described for the Project.

The construction contractors to be employed by REX, TIGT, and TPC would hire construction personnel; these would include REX, TIGT, and TPC employees, construction inspection staff, and safety and environmental inspection staff. Due to the geographic location of the Project, it is anticipated that a portion of the total labor force would be hired from the local workforce, while other personnel would be hired from outside the Project areas. It is anticipated that approximately 50 percent of the total

RESOURCE REPORT 5**Socioeconomics**

Project construction personnel would come from the respective local workforces, as available. This would result in some beneficial outcomes, such as temporarily lowering the counties and cities' unemployment rates and, depending upon the rate at which skilled and experienced local staff are available and the positions to which these personnel are assigned, may increase the average per capita income in the areas. The remaining 50 percent of the construction workforce would consist of non-local hires. Environmental inspection staff would most likely consist entirely of non-local employees based on the specialized skills and experience required for those positions.

There would be minimal long-term impacts on the existing socioeconomic environment of the Project areas. REX anticipates that there would be no permanent employees needed to operate the new aboveground facilities for compression, metering, and regulating. The lack of permanent employees at the new Project facilities would have no effect on the Project area's existing socioeconomic environment including employment and per capita income. The impact on the existing socioeconomic environment for the Blanket Authorization facilities would be similar to that described for the Project.

5.2 HOUSING**5.2.1 Existing Housing Conditions**

Due to the short-term nature of the construction timeframe for the Project and Blanket Authorization facilities and the number of construction workers that would be pulled from the local workforce, it is anticipated that most non-local construction personnel would seek short-term housing (i.e., rentals and hotels). Table 5-3 shows the housing characteristics of the associated counties in which the Project and Blanket Authorization facilities are located, as well as the nearby communities that could potentially be affected by the Project. The table includes the total number of housing units, occupied housing units, vacant housing units, and vacancy rates for those areas.

**Table 5-3
Existing Housing Conditions in the Project and Blanket Authorization
Facilities Areas**

County/State	Total Housing Units 2015-2019 ^a	Occupied Housing Units 2015-2019 ^a	Vacant Housing Units 2015-2019 ^a	Average Homeowner Vacancy Rate (percent) 2015-2019 ^a
Colorado				
State of Colorado	2,386,475	2,148,994	237,481	1.1
Weld County	109,170	104,671	4,499	0.5
Logan County	9,108	8,393	715	0.6
Sedgwick County	1,191	967	224	0.7

RESOURCE REPORT 5**Socioeconomics**

**Table 5-3
Existing Housing Conditions in the Project and Blanket Authorization
Facilities Areas**

County/State	Total Housing Units 2015-2019 ^a	Occupied Housing Units 2015-2019 ^a	Vacant Housing Units 2015-2019 ^a	Average Homeowner Vacancy Rate (percent) 2015-2019 ^a
Nebraska				
State of Nebraska	837,476	759,176	78,300	1.0
Kimball County	1,924	1,577	347	3.3
Franklin County	1,713	1,377	336	2.1
Webster County	1,905	1,507	398	0.7
Jefferson County	3,921	3,302	619	0.0
Perkins County	1,446	1,228	218	0.6
Lincoln County	16,802	14,856	1946	0.8
Kearney County	2,967	2,666	301	1.4
Adams County	13,906	12,712	1194	0.8
Clay County	3,007	2,539	468	0.8
Fillmore County	2,928	2,510	418	1.9
Saline County	5,858	5,157	701	0.4

^a U.S. Census Bureau, Table DP04 Selected Housing Characteristics, 2015-2019 5-Year ACS Survey Estimates

5.2.2 Temporary Housing Conditions

Table 5-4 summarizes the temporary housing conditions in the areas affected by the Project.

**Table 5-4
Existing Temporary Housing Conditions in Project and Blanket
Authorization Facilities Areas**

County/State	Rental Vacancy Rate (percent) 2015-2019 ^a	2021 Hotels/Motels ^b	Mobile Homes 2015-2019 ^{a1}
Colorado			
State of Colorado	4.8	---	96234
Weld County	4.5	30	7530
Logan County	7.2	9	802
Sedgwick County	9.8	4	87
Nebraska			
State of Nebraska	5.6	---	27768
Kimball County	10.9	6	184
Franklin County	17.1	1	68
Webster County	6.7	4	44
Jefferson County	6.3	4	94
Perkins County	7.8	1	31
Lincoln County	5.0	28	1395

**Table 5-4
Existing Temporary Housing Conditions in Project and Blanket
Authorization Facilities Areas**

County/State	Rental Vacancy Rate (percent) 2015-2019 ^a	2021 Hotels/Motels ^b	Mobile Homes 2015-2019 ^{a1}
Kearney County	2.4	4	230
Adams County	5.5	12	604
Clay County	6.0	0	83
Fillmore County	2.4	3	26
Saline County	0.0	4	202

^a U.S. Census Bureau, Table DP04 Selected Housing Characteristics, 2015-2019 5-Year ACS Estimates

^b Google Hotel Search. 2021. www.google.com

¹ Mobile homes listed in this table are a subset of the "Occupied Housing Units" pulled from the 2015-2019 5-Year ACS estimates.

A key indicator of housing availability to meet short-term needs of the workforce required by the Project is the number of available rental units; another vital component of evaluating temporary local housing conditions is the number of hotel and motel rooms within the Project vicinity. Given the assumption that approximately half of the construction workforce would be hired from the local workforce, the need for temporary housing for construction workers is relatively low and would be accommodated by the number of available hotels/motels and vacancy rates in the Project and Blanket Authorization facilities areas. There are approximately 100 hotels or motels near the proposed Project and Blanket Authorization facilities, which should be enough to cover the needed construction workforce needing short-term housing during the construction of the Project. The lack of hotels/motels in some of the smaller communities near some of the Project facility locations should not pose a problem for housing construction workers due to the proximity to larger communities with more accommodations. Additionally, the rental vacancy rate in Campbell, Nebraska, Medicine, Nebraska, and Crook, Colorado is relatively higher than the vacancy rate for their respective counties, which indicates that there are additional residency options for non-local construction workforce.

5.2.3 Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation

For the construction activities for the Project, it is anticipated that approximately 50 percent of the workforce would be hired locally and would not require temporary housing. As work would be completed in approximately 9 months, worker housing for non-local contract workers would likely utilize existing temporary housing facilities, such as hotels/motels, rental homes, mobile homes (that are temporarily relocated to the Project areas in an RV Park) and camping facilities. Some workers would likely return to their out-of-area homes on weekends and holidays, and therefore the demand for these

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

individuals would likely focus on hotels/motels. Some contract construction workers could use travel trailers and would, thus, require campsite or trailer park spaces. Some workers who would be employed for several months might use rental housing but given the short duration of construction this would involve a limited number of units. REX doesn't expect to hire any new employees for the operation and maintenance of the aboveground facilities for compression, metering, and regulating. Given this, the Project's operation will have no significant impact on the availability of permanent housing in the Project areas. The impacts to housing in the area from the construction and operation of the Blanket Authorization facilities would be similar to those described for the Project and would also not have a significant impact on housing availability.

No significant direct or indirect impacts on housing stock are anticipated either during construction or operation of the Project. REX, TIGT, and TPC identified no other major construction projects to be undertaken within the Project areas, other than some ongoing transportation projects, that might compete for temporary housing units during the anticipated 9-month construction phase. Existing housing within the Project and Blanket Authorization facilities areas appears to be sufficient to meet the needs of the limited additional population.

5.3 PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES

5.3.1 Existing Public Services and Facilities

In general, public services are available near the Project and Blanket Authorization facilities areas. All counties that contain Project and Blanket Authorization facilities have Police/Sheriff departments. Weld County, Colorado has several police/sheriff departments, as well as several fire departments in the communities near the Project facilities. The communities of Hastings and Minden, Nebraska have fire stations as well as police/sheriff stations located within their boundaries. Medical facilities are available in Adams and Kearney County, Nebraska and Sedgwick County, Colorado near the Project facilities. This includes the Sedgwick County Health Center in Julesburg, Colorado; the Kearney County Health Services Facility in Minden, Nebraska; the Mary Lanning Healthcare Facility and Hastings Medical Park in Hastings, Nebraska. Several of the smaller communities do not have medical facilities due to their population size and proximity to a larger community that contains medical centers/facilities with enough capacity. Table 5-5 provides an overview of police/sheriff departments, fire and rescue departments, and medical facilities available near the Project areas.

RESOURCE REPORT 5**Socioeconomics**

**Table 5-5
Existing Public Services and Facilities in Project and Blanket Authorization
Facilities Areas (2021)**

County/State	Police/Sheriff Departments^a	Fire and Rescue Departments^b	Medical Facilities^{c,1} (approx # beds)
Colorado			
Weld County	20	10	20+ (248+ beds)
Logan County	3	1	2 (50 beds)
Sedgwick County	1	0	1 (18 beds)
Nebraska			
Kimball County	2	1	1 (unknown beds)
Franklin County	3	1	1 (14 beds)
Webster County	1	1	0
Jefferson County	3	2	1 (17 beds)
Perkins County	1	0	0
Lincoln County	3	0	1 (116 beds)
Kearney County	2	1	4 (64 beds)
Adams County	2	1	0
Clay County	6	3	0
Fillmore County	3	2	2 (20 beds)
Saline County	4	3	0

^a USA Cops. 2021. www.usacops.com

^b USA Fire and Rescue. 2021. www.usafireandrescue.com

^c Google Earth Medical Facility Search. 2021. www.googleearth.com

¹ The term medical facility is limited to county health centers, county hospitals, district hospitals, hospitals, and regional medical centers.

5.3.2 Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation

Minor temporary impacts on public services and facilities are anticipated during construction of the Project and Blanket Authorization facilities. Some of the Project facilities are located near a densely populated area (Weld County, Colorado, Kearney, Nebraska, and Hastings, Nebraska) which provide public services and infrastructure to the smaller communities on the outskirts of the populated areas. However, emergency “911” service covers the entire Project area. Additionally, larger communities are located near the Project areas that could provide a wider array of public services and infrastructure. These larger communities include: Sidney, Nebraska located

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

approximately 10 miles north of the Logan Compressor and Regulating Station; Ogallala, Nebraska which is approximately 20 miles northwest of the Mid-American Ethanol Regulating Station; North Platte, Nebraska located approximately 21 miles from the North Platte Livestock Feeder Regulating Station; Kearney, Nebraska located approximately 8 miles from the Adams Meter and Regulating Station, and finally Beatrice, Nebraska located approximately 14 miles east of the REX Lateral to TPC East.

Impacts on police/sheriff services could include an increased level of traffic violations associated with additional vehicle trips, potential interruptions in traffic flows during equipment deliveries, and potential emergency situations involving traffic accidents or work-related injuries. The increased level of service required is projected to be within the capacity of the existing law enforcement agencies of the counties in which the Project facilities are located.

Impacts to local fire departments could include an increased number of emergency situations involving traffic accidents or work-related injuries, and an increased potential for rangeland/grassland fires. Depending on the construction schedule, fire potential could be high. Some Project construction activities, such as welding, would increase fire potential if they were to occur during the season when fire potential is greatest. However, welding activities would be confined to previously cleared areas within the Project's approved workspaces and would be conducted in accordance with accepted industry safety measures. The Project would be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained in accordance with the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) Safety Standards in 49 CFR Part 192. Impacts to local fire departments are projected to be within the capacity of each department.

Medical facilities exist in the Counties containing Project facilities, as well as specifically in the nearby communities of Julesburg, Colorado and Kearney, Hastings, Minden and Beatrice, Nebraska (see Table 5-5). The proposed Project could increase the level of service required at some of these facilities, with the majority of the impact due to injuries or illnesses to construction crews that may occur. The increase in labor force required for the Project is not expected to overburden the existing facilities.

No new permanent hires are anticipated in association with this Project and therefore no impacts to schools or other social services are anticipated. Impacts to public services from the project would be temporary in nature and largely limited to emergency services.

Impacts to public services (such as police, fire departments, medical facilities, and schools) from the construction and operation of the Blanket Authorization facilities would

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

be similar in nature to those described for the Project and would also not result in overburdens to the public services in the areas.

5.4 TRANSPORTATION

5.4.1 Existing Conditions

The existing network of county and state roads would be used by Project and Blanket Authorization facilities construction crews. These roads would be used on a temporary basis to transport personnel, equipment, vehicles (including high clearance vehicles and heavy trucks), and materials to the Project areas. The Project facilities are in predominately rural areas intermixed with industrial operations (primarily other oil and gas operations) as well as small rural communities that are close to nearby larger population centers. Most the county and residential roads near the Project areas are constructed of gravel and/or dirt. A total of 15 new or existing access roads would be constructed or improved for the Project to provide temporary access to the pipeline ROW and would be returned to their previous land use after construction. Seventeen permanent access roads (PARs) would be constructed for the Project to allow access to the new aboveground facilities for compression, metering, and regulating as well as the ancillary facilities. A total of 14 access roads would be constructed or improved for the Blanket Authorization facilities to provide access to the lateral and would be returned to their previous use after construction. Two PARs would be constructed for the Blanket Authorization facilities to allow access to the new ancillary facilities.

5.4.2 Construction and Operation Impacts and Mitigation

In general, construction crews would work six days a week during the construction phase of the Project. However, variables in equipment availability, material supplies, and weather delays may require the crews to work seven days a week to meet Project schedule. It is anticipated that admittance to the Project areas would be controlled, and access would be limited. To maintain safe conditions, REX, TIGT, and TPC would direct its construction contractors to ensure enforcement of local weight restrictions and limitations for construction vehicles accessing the Project areas. Additionally, REX, TIGT, and TPC will require the selected Contractor(s) to develop and implement a Traffic Control Plan with specific traffic management measures to minimize traffic impacts on local roadways. Movement of construction equipment, materials, and crew members would result in a short-term impact on the local transportation network. Impacts on local traffic levels are not expected to be significant due to the relatively small, estimated workforce spread out geographically along the Project areas. Although construction workers would commute to and from the Project areas from their permanent homes or from temporary housing or hotels/motels in local and outlying

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

towns and cities, this would typically begin before sunrise and end after sunset, times of the day when daily local traffic is light.

Construction of the Project would result in daily increases in traffic. However, impacts would be manageable due to the relatively small size of the Project workforce and timing of traffic. The Project would not have any measurable impacts on road congestion during operation, as the number of permanent workers would be minimal and spread out across the geography of the Project areas in Colorado and Nebraska.

Impacts from construction and operation of the Blanket Authorization facilities would be similar to those described for the Project and would also not have any significant impacts to the transportation network in Colorado and Nebraska.

5.5 PROPERTY VALUES

The construction of the facilities associated with the Project would temporarily affect approximately 687.94 acres of land; the permanent facilities would affect 264.78 acres of land. More detailed information on land use is presented in Resource Report 8.

The exact effects of a pipeline on property values are difficult to determine. Appraisal methods used to value land are based on subjective characteristics of the property and any improvements. The impact a pipeline may have on the value of a tract of land depends on many factors, including size, location of the facility on the property, values of adjacent properties, presence of other pipelines and utilities, current land value and current land use.

Most of the Project area is characterized as rangeland and agricultural, utility rights of way, and industrial/commercial land. Acreages of temporary and permanent impacts to the various land uses crossed by the Project are provided in Section 8.2 of Resource Report 8. As necessary, compensatory measures will be agreed upon with affected landowner(s). The Project would not permanently impact any developed land uses or residential land. The Project would impact approximately 522.56 acres of agricultural land. Agricultural land that is impacted by the proposed new laterals and the Blanket Authorization lateral, (approximately 498.74 acres) could be returned to production once the lateral is constructed and in operation. The areas currently used for agricultural production would be temporarily removed from production during the time of construction. Landowners and/or agricultural tenants would be compensated to prevent any economic loss. The only permanent loss of agricultural production would be at the locations of the aboveground and ancillary facilities. The overall acreage impact is minimal and should have an insignificant impact on the economy. Landowners will also be compensated for the right to place such facilities aboveground and remove the area from current agricultural production. Property owners whose lands are traversed by

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

pipeline easements may see minor reductions in property taxes as property rights within the easement would be restricted. Potential compensation to landowners for possible adverse effects to property values would be addressed during easement negotiations.

5.6 DISPLACEMENT OF RESIDENCES OR BUSINESS

No businesses or residences would be removed or displaced by construction and operation of the Project or Blanket Authorization facilities. Of the 41.0 miles of proposed new laterals to be constructed under the Project, 76 percent (31.3 miles) would be co-located with other existing pipeline ROWs. Additionally, approximately 95.8 percent of the REX Lateral to TPC Adams and 92.7 percent of the REX Lateral to TPC East are located on previously disturbed lands (co-located with other pipelines and/or located on actively worked farmland, etc.), and overall the majority of the Project (including both the laterals and the aboveground and ancillary facilities) is located adjacent to other existing infrastructure (including oil and gas development, power transmission lines and facilities, roads, rail storage yards, etc.).

5.7 CONSTRUCTION PAYROLL, MATERIALS PURCHASE, AND TAX REVENUES

Construction and operation of the Project and Blanket Authorization facilities are anticipated to have beneficial impacts on local sales tax revenue. An unspecified amount of sales tax revenue would be generated by the temporary influx of workers who would purchase local goods and services. Additionally, REX, TIGT, and TPC and the contractors would make local materials purchases, and would pay sales tax for the lease and/or rental of various office spaces and construction equipment. The sales tax is paid to the state, county, and city where the material is purchased. In addition, local businesses would benefit from demands for goods and services generated by the temporary construction workforce. Benefits would apply to many establishments adjacent to the Project area where local purchases for some of the materials necessary for the Project would be made. REX, TIGT, and TPC estimate that local purchases made by personnel associated with the construction of the Project would primarily include consumables, fuel, and miscellaneous construction-related materials.

Payroll taxes would be collected from both the local and non-local workers employed on the Project. This would temporarily increase tax revenue for the state of Colorado and state of Nebraska, as well as all the associated counties in which the Project facilities are located. However, on a state-wide basis, the increase is anticipated to be minimal.

During operation of the Project and Blanket Authorization facilities, REX, TIGT, and TPC would pay property taxes to the counties for the land on which the Project and Blanket Authorization facilities are located. Local governments typically use tax

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

revenues for infrastructure improvements such as roads, schools, and health facilities, and to meet other needs of the community.

5.8 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Executive Order (EO) 12898 on Environmental Justice (EJ) requires that each federal agency address disproportionately high and adverse health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations. The Project has been sited to minimize adverse human health or environmental effects by avoiding population centers and sensitive environmental resources.

In order for a location to be considered a potential EJ area of concern, the minority population of the area must be “meaningfully greater” than that of the respective county. Any census tract/block group with a percentage of residents above the minority thresholds established for the county is identified as a potential EJ area of concern. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, minority populations are those groups that include Black or African Americans, American Indians or Alaskan Natives, Asians, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders, Hispanics or Latinos, and other races. These population categories were used to determine the minority percentage for incorporated populations near the Project area. For the purposes of this analysis, thresholds were used to determine the minority population and low-income EJ areas of concern, instead of an absolute number. These thresholds are based on percentages of minority and low-income populations and reflect the composition of minorities more appropriately than would the use of absolute numbers. EJ populations are defined as: (1) a minority population greater than 50 percent; (2) a minority population that is *meaningfully greater* (i.e., more than 10 percent higher) than the reference county or state value; (3) census tracts where over 50 percent of the population is below the poverty level; or (4) those census units where the percentage of total population below poverty level that is more than 10 percent higher than the county (or state) as a whole.

Table 5-6 describes the minority and low-income populations along the abandoned portion of the Trailblazer Pipeline. Table 5-7 describes the minority and low-income populations for the Project areas that include new or modified sites compared to the county and state averages.

**Table 5-6
Population, Race, and Poverty Statistics in Project Abandonment Areas**

County/State/Census Tract (Project Facility)	Total Population ^a	Race as a Percentage of Total Population ^b								Total Minority Population (%)	Population below Poverty Level ^c (%)
		White alone	Black or African American alone	American Indian and Alaska Native alone	Asian alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	Hispanic or Latino	Some Other Race alone	Two or More Races		
State of Colorado	5,773,714	65.1	3.8	0.6	3.4	0.2	21.9	0.5	4.5	34.9	9.3
Weld County	328,981	62.6	1.3	0.4	1.7	0.1	29.9	0.4	3.6	37.4	10
Census Tract 23 (No facility other than Pipeline)	5,867	74.6	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.1	19.6	0.3	4.6	25.5	8.9
Census Tract 25.01 (TPC West Isolation; Hereford Interconnect, pipeline)	5,889	81.5	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.1	11.8	0.3	5.6	18.5	7.3
Logan County	21,528	75.9	3.5	0.7	0.6	0.1	16.3	0.2	2.7	24.1	12.6
Census Tract 9659 (ECGS Interconnect; Logan Interconnect; Compressor Station 601)	1,101	86.9	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.0	9.6	0.4	2.0	13.1	11.2
Sedgwick County	2,404	80.4	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.0	15.1	0.3	3.1	19.6	19
Census Tract 9683 (Sedgwick Interconnect; pipeline)	2,404	80.4	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.0	15.1	0.3	3.1	19.6	19
State of Wyoming	576,851	81.4	0.8	2.0	0.9	0.1	10.2	0.4	4.1	18.6	10.1
Laramie County	100,512	74.9	2.2	0.6	1.2	0.1	15.5	0.5	4.9	25.1	9.9
Census Tract 20 (No facility other than Pipeline)	4,571	85.2	0.4	0.3	0.9	0.0	9.5	0.4	3.4	14.8	8.4
State of Nebraska	1,961,504	75.7	4.8	0.8	2.7	0.1	12.0	0.3	3.7	24.3	9.9
Kimball County	3,434	88.1	0.0	0.7	0.4	0.0	7.6	0.3	2.8	11.9	10.8
Census Tract 9545 (Redtail Lateral and Interconnect, pipeline)	3,434	88.1	0.0	0.7	0.4	0.0	7.6	0.3	2.8	11.9	10.8
Perkins County	2,858	91.7	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	5.1	0.1	2.5	8.3	5
Census Tract 9593 (Mid-American Ethanol Interconnect, pipeline)	2,858	91.7	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	5.1	0.1	2.5	8.3	5
Lincoln County	34,676	85.5	1.1	0.4	0.9	0.0	8.7	0.3	3.0	14.5	9.9
Census Tract 9606 (Oppliger Lincoln Interconnect; Compressor Station 602; North Platte Livestock Feeder Interconnect, pipeline)	3,963	89.8	0.5	0.2	1.0	0.0	5.4	0.8	2.3	10.2	5
Census Tract 9597 (No facility other than Pipeline)	3,483	92.6	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.0	3.4	0.1	3.3	7.4	5.5
Dawson County	24,111	56.1	4.9	0.2	0.8	0.2	35.8	0.2	1.7	43.9	12.7
Census Tract 9686 (No facility other than Pipeline)	1,449	87.1	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.0	10.2	0.0	2.1	12.9	4.6
Frontier County	2,519	92.8	0.7	0.2	0.0	0.1	3.2	0.2	2.8	7.2	9
Census Tract 9611 (No facility other than Pipeline)	2,519	92.8	0.7	0.2	0.0	0.1	3.2	0.2	2.8	7.2	9
Gosper County	1,893	92.2	0.1	0.2	0.6	0.0	5.0	0.0	1.8	7.8	5.4
Census Tract 9676 (No facility other than Pipeline)	1,893	92.2	0.1	0.2	0.6	0.0	5.0	0.0	1.8	7.8	5.4
Phelps County	8,968	90.8	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.0	6.1	0.3	1.9	9.2	9.6
Census Tract 9672 (No facility other than Pipeline)	2,988	91.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.0	5.8	0.4	1.8	8.8	5.4
Kearney County	6,688	90.7	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	5.8	0.2	2.9	9.3	9.9
Census Tract 9666 (Compressor Station 603, pipeline)	3,453	93.3	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	3.5	0.1	2.7	6.7	6.6
Adams County	31,205	82.6	0.8	0.4	1.3	0.0	11.7	0.2	2.9	17.4	15.5
Census Tract 9662 (Adams Interconnect)	2,245	96.7	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.0	1.6	0.1	1.2	3.3	7.2

Table 5-6
Population, Race, and Poverty Statistics in Project Abandonment Areas

County/State/Census Tract (Project Facility)	Total Population ^a	Race as a Percentage of Total Population ^b								Total Minority Population (%)	Population below Poverty Level ^c (%)
		White alone	Black or African American alone	American Indian and Alaska Native alone	Asian alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	Hispanic or Latino	Some Other Race alone	Two or More Races		
Clay County	6,104	88.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.0	8.6	0.2	2.7	12.0	10.5
Census Tract 9622 (Clay Interconnect)	2,640	93.4	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.1	3.1	6.6	10
Fillmore County	5,551	93.3	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.0	3.2	0.0	2.5	6.7	8.8
Census Tract 917 (No facility other than Pipeline)	3,404	92.5	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.0	3.4	0.0	3.2	7.5	9.2
Census Tract 916 (TPC East Isolation, pipeline)	2,147	94.7	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.0	2.9	0.0	1.5	5.3	8.3

**Table 5-7
Population, Race, and Poverty Statistics in Project and Blanket Authorization Facilities Areas**

County/State/Census Tract (Project Facility)	Total Population ^a	Race as a Percentage of Total Population ^b								Total Minority Population (%)	Population below Poverty Level (%) ^c
		White	African American	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Persons Reporting Two or More Races	Persons of Hispanic or Latino Origin	Some Other Race		
State of Colorado	5,610,349	83.9	4.2	0.9	3.2	0.2	3.7	21.5	3.9	37.5	10.1
Weld County	305,345	90.3	1.2	0.8	1.6	0.1	3.0	29.5	3.0	39.1	9.8
Census Tract 25.01 (REX/TPC Lone Tree Interconnect; Hereford Compressor Station)	5,535	96.9	0.2	0.3	0.02	0.02	2.2	12.8	0.3	15.8	7.3
Logan County	22,380	91.4	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	4.1	16.8	1.1	25.4	12.1
Census Tract 9659 (ECGS Regulating Station; Logan Compressor and Regulating Station)	1,030	96.4	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	1.8	6.0	1.2	9.6	11.1
Sedgwick County	2,322	93.7	0.8	0.6	0.9	0.0	1.4	13.4	2.5	19.8	18.7
Census Tract 9683 (Sedgwick Compressor Station; Sedgwick East Compressor Station)	2,322	93.7	0.8	0.6	0.9	0.0	1.4	13.4	2.5	19.8	18.7
State of Nebraska	1,914,571	87.1	4.8	0.9	2.4	0.07	2.6	10.9	2.1	23.8	10.8
Kimball County	3,633	94.2	0.08	1.2	0.3	0.0	4.1	9.6	0.1	15.3	10.7
Census Tract 9545 (Redtail Compressor Station)	3,633	94.2	0.08	1.2	0.3	0.0	4.1	9.6	0.1	15.3	10.7
Perkins County	2,901	98.6	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.5	4.2	0.6	5.6	5.0
Census Tract 9593 (Mid-American Ethanol Regulating Station)	2,901	98.6	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.5	4.2	0.6	5.5	5.0
Lincoln County	35,263	94.8	1.5	0.4	0.9	0.03	1.6	8.6	0.8	13.8	9.6
Census Tract 9606 (Oppliger Lincoln Regulating Station; North Platte Livestock Feeder Regulating Station)	3,818	95.4	0.4	0.0	0.3	0.03	2.6	4.8	1.3	9.4	5.0
Adams County	31,587	93.0	0.6	0.4	1.3	0.02	1.9	10.3	2.7	17.3	11.9
Census Tract 9662 (REX Lateral to TPC Adams; MLV Site for Adams Lateral; Adams Meter and Regulating Station)	2,402	94.3	0.3	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.6	1.2	0.08	6.9	7.1
Franklin County	2,987	97.7	0.5	0.03	0.2	0.1	1.2	2.3	0.3	4.6	14.2
Census Tract 9646 (REX Lateral to TPC Adams; Adams Launcher Site)	1,384	97.8	0.6	0.07	0.07	0.0	0.9	3.6	0.6	5.9	11.2
Webster County	3,537	95.4	0.3	0.9	0.0	0.4	2.5	5.1	0.5	9.7	10.5
Census Tract 9650 (REX Lateral to TPC Adams)	1,809	96.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	2.3	4.1	0.4	7.6	6.3
Fillmore County	5,547	96.9	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.0	1.2	3.9	0.4	7.0	8.5
Census Tract 916 (Fairmont Receiver Site)	2,251	98.7	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.9	3.6	0.0	4.9	8.0
Saline County	14,270	88.8	2.5	0.2	1.9	0.0	2.8	25.3	3.7	36.5	14.2
Census Tract 9608 (REX Lateral to TPC East; REX to TPC East Meter and Regulating Station)	1,408	97.2	1.3	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.7	2.1	0.1	4.9	8.1
Jefferson County	7,144	96.9	0.6	0.2	0.2	0.0	1.6	4.3	0.4	7.3	11.1
Census Tract 9636 (REX Lateral to TPC East; TPC East Launcher Site; MLV Site for TPC East Lateral)	3,170	98.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	2.7	0.3	4.4	6.1

^a U.S. Census Bureau, Table S0101 Age and Sex, 2015-2019 5-Year ACS Estimates

^b U.S. Census Bureau, Table S1701 Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months, 2015-2019 5-Year ACS Estimates

^c U.S. Census Bureau, Table DP05 ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates, 2015-2019 5-Year ACS Estimates

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

According to the data presented in Table 5-6 and 5-7, the communities near the proposed Project areas are primarily inhabited by populations identified as Caucasian and persons of Hispanic or Latino origin. None of the communities analyzed have percentages of minority populations that are above 50 percent or meaningfully greater (more than 10 percent) than the corresponding minority population at the county or state level. It should be noted that Weld County has a higher population of persons of Hispanic or Latino origin than the State of Colorado, though not enough to qualify as potential EJ populations. Additionally, Saline County, Nebraska has a total minority population that is more than 10 percent higher than the State of Nebraska total minority population, and a population of persons of Hispanic or Latino origin that is more than double that of the State of Nebraska. However, it should be noted census tract 9608 that contains the proposed Project facilities has much lower percentages of minority population and persons of Hispanic or Latino origin which means that the specific community in which the Project is constructed would not be considered an EJ population.

All of the census tracts containing Project facilities generally have the percentage of those living in poverty that are in line with, or only slightly higher than, the State of Colorado or Nebraska percentage of those living below poverty. In addition, as shown in Tables 5-2, 5-6, and 5-7, the incomes in the nearby communities are consistently slightly lower than the county and state incomes. While some of the median incomes for these communities are lower than those of the respective county, none of them are lower by more than half the respective counties' median household incomes. Therefore, there would be no disproportionate impact to low-income populations. It is noted that Sedgwick County and census tract 9683 are within 0.7 percent of qualifying as an EJ community based on poverty criteria. In reviewing on the EJSCREEN tool this area was not flagged as an area of high concern (81-100 percent in comparison to the country); however, census tract 9683 was identified as an area of moderate concern for poverty at 70-80 percent in relation to the county (this could also be closely related to the higher age of residents and lack of people of workforce age). The proposed abandonment activities within Sedgwick County and census tract 9683 exclusively involves abandonment in-place of the pipeline, including the cut and cap of the Trailblazer pipeline. No earth disturbance related to abandonment would occur within this area; therefore, construction activities related to abandonment would not disproportionately impact the local population. Sedgwick County census tract 9683 does contain the proposed Sedgwick Compressor Station and the Sedgwick East Compressor Station which would require temporary earth disturbances during construction and would contain permanent operating aboveground facilities. These two compressor stations would have electric-driven compressors installed in them as opposed to natural gas

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

fired compressors, which means there would be no air emissions from these facilities in this census tract that is close to being considered an EJ community. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not subject low-income populations to disproportionate adverse impacts.

Additionally, utilizing EJSCREEN, three census tracts have been identified as having significant populations over the age of 64. These tracts include: census tract 9611 in Frontier County, NE, census tract 9683 in Sedgwick County, CO, and census tract 9545 in Kimball County, NE. Populations over 64 (and populations under 5) have a higher risk of being negatively affected by air, water, and land pollution. REX, TPC, and TIGT have established clearly defined protocols for pipeline abandonment activities as well as for construction and operation of new facilities including how the pipeline will be cleaned and waste disposed, and how to construct and operate facilities to safeguard the potential to increase risk to aging populations as a result of the project abandonment, construction, or operation activities. Additionally, public involvement in these areas (as described further below) will take the higher presence of the aged population into account when planning and holding public outreach.

In addition to the EJSCREEN tool from the EPA, the census tracts containing Project facilities were analyzed using the beta version of the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) Climate and Economic Justice Screening tool. In response to EO 14008, the purpose of the tool is to help federal agencies identify disadvantaged communities that are marginalized, underserved, and overburdened by pollution. The current version of the tool provides socioeconomic, environmental, health and climate information to inform decisions that may affect these communities. The tool identifies disadvantaged communities through publicly available, nationally consistent datasets. The census tracts containing Project facilities (including abandonment, new construction of laterals or aboveground facilities, and blanket authorization facilities) were reviewed through the Climate and Economic Justice screening tool, and all were listed as not being disadvantaged. This determination was made because none of the census tracts were above the threshold for one or more environmental or climate indicators in addition to being above the threshold for socioeconomic indicators. This tool specifically analyzes health burdens on communities from historic pollution; it will flag a community as disadvantaged if the community is at the 90th percentile for asthma or diabetes or heart disease or low life expectancy and is above the 65th percentile for low income and at or below 20 percent for higher ed enrollment rate. The census tracts containing Project components were also screened specifically for disadvantaged communities in terms of health burdens and none were identified as such.

Where possible, REX, TIGT, and TPC chose facility locations that were located next to or near areas that had previously been developed for natural gas handling purposes

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

and that have limited potential for environmental effects; these facility locations are sited at some distance from sensitive areas (residential areas, schools, hospitals, etc.). Most of the proposed new aboveground facilities are located in rural/agricultural areas and are generally located approximately 3-5 miles (or greater) from the nearby population centers (which include small rural towns or larger cities). The following aboveground facilities have a rural residence within 1 mile of the proposed facility:

- Redtail Lateral and Interconnect and Compressor Station – rural residence approximately 1 mile southwest
- ECGS Interconnect and Regulating Station – rural residence approximately 0.3 miles northeast
- Logan Interconnect and Compressor and Regulating Station – rural residence approximately 0.25 miles northwest, and one 0.3 miles southwest
- Sedgwick East Interconnect and Compressor Station – rural residence approximately 0.25 miles southeast

None of the proposed aboveground facilities are located in close proximity to schools or larger residential areas. There are several mitigation measures that have been identified in Resource Report 9 that will be implemented for potential air emissions and noise impacts to protect nearby minority populations as well as the greater populations in the Project area. Some of these mitigation measures include:

Construction Mitigation Measures

- Minimizing exhaust emissions from diesel and gasoline- fueled construction equipment and vehicle engines
- Minimizing vehicle and equipment idling time to the extent practical during construction
- Utilize dust suppression techniques to minimize fugitive dust during construction
- Limiting emissions from potential surface coating by purchasing and installing most piping and structural components that have been prepared and coated in shops prior to shipment to the construction site.
- REX, TPC, and TIGT will not burn any brush, slash, or materials generated from construction activities.

Operational Mitigation Measures

- REX, TPC, and TIGT will install equipment that, at a minimum, meet the emission limitations found in the applicable New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) described in Resource Report 9 or state regulations.

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

- Engines will be equipped with oxidation catalyst systems to reduce CO, VOC, and formaldehyde emissions below applicable emission standards and permit limits.
- Compressor units will be of “lean burn design” and be equipped with the lowest available NOx controls per manufacturer specification.
- REX, TPC, and TIGT will develop and implement an operation and maintenance plan consistent with the manufacturer’s recommendations for good combustion practices.
- REX, TPC, and TIGT will operate and maintain compressors according to manufacturer recommendations
- REX, TPC, and TIGT will monitor and replace reciprocating rod packing seals based on manufacturer or regulatory requirement.
- REX, TPC, and TIGT will conduct optical gas imagining camera surveys annually to catch and repair fugitive leaks from piping components at compressor stations.
- REX, TPC, and TIGT will install low or intermittent bleed controllers and will conduct routine maintenance to prevent malfunctions from occurring.
- REX will have enclosures (buildings) around the proposed new compressor stations to reduce noise from the facilities.
- REX will install engine exhaust systems that include a silencer-catalyst system that provides the required minimum dynamic sound insertion loss (DIL) values.
- At the Logan Compressor and Regulating Station, REX will cover the exhaust expansion joint with acoustical blanket materials with adequate thermal rating. Also, the engine exhaust piping that extends between the skid enclosure and exhaust silencer will be covered with acoustical lagging material with adequate thermal rating.
- REX will install and engine air inlet system at the Logan Compressor and Regulating Station that is designed to provide the required DIL values.
- REX will have unit blowdown silencers at the facilities that attenuate the unsilenced blowdown noise to the required noise levels at 300 feet from the outlet of the silencer.
- REX will design flow-control valves (FCVs) to meet 90 decibels (dBA) for the full range of operating conditions at regulating and metering stations and will also cover aboveground gas piping associated with the flow-control skid with acceptable acoustical insulation.

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

With these proposed mitigation measures in place, the proposed Project would not subject potential EJ communities or populations to disproportionate adverse impacts.

Finally, REX and TPC will hold public meetings that will provide additional information to the local communities and will provide opportunities for those populations near the Project facilities to comment on the proposed Project. At the time of this submittal, REX and TPC are planning on holding in-person open house-style meetings at three locations centrally located to Project facilities (namely near the Project laterals). Specifically, REX and TPC plan to hold these in-person meetings in Sterling, Colorado, and Kearney, Beatrice, and Hastings, Nebraska. They will be held in public places that are known to the community and easy to access (such as community centers, churches, and/or schools); these meetings will take place in the evenings from approximately 4-8 PM and will be set up in an open house format so members of the public can come and go as their schedules permit. REX and TPC will have different stations for the various aspects of the Project, including Environmental, Land, Engineering, and Construction/Safety, where members of REX or TPC and/or their consultants will be available to talk to the public, answer questions, and provide more information about the Project. The public will be encouraged to provide comments on the proposed Project at these in-person meetings by writing on comment cards available at the meetings. Additionally, there will be information on how to submit comments electronically directly to FERC or to REX/TPC. These three in-person meetings are the initial ones REX and TPC are currently planning to hold with the option to add additional in-person, or virtual meetings as needed. The meetings will be advertised in local newspapers or publications and affected landowners and adjacent landowners will receive information regarding the planned meetings through the mail.

In addition to the planned in-person open house public meetings, REX and TPC will host a virtual presentation that provides an overview of the project, as well as information on construction, environmental, and land on the project website. Instructions on how to access this information online will be provided to the public. People who view the online materials will also have the opportunity to submit comments on the Project through the Project and/or FERC's website.

Based on the information gained through the U.S. Census Bureau, the EPA EJSCREEN and the beta version of the CEQ Climate and Environmental Justice Screening Tool, there are no official EJ populations that would be disproportionately affected by the proposed Project. Additionally, REX, TPC, and TIGT have mitigation and minimization measures in place during both the construction and operation of the proposed Project to protect the communities and the environment in proximity to the proposed Project. Finally, REX, TPC, and TIGT are committed to engaging in meaningful public involvement in the communities that would be directly affected by the Project. As a

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

result of these factors, it is not expected that any potential EJ communities would be disproportionately adversely affected by the proposed Project.

5.9 REFERENCES

- Google Hotel Search. 2021. www.google.com/. (Accessed October 2017).
- Google Maps. 2017. Accessed Online at: <http://maps.google.com/>. (Accessed October 2017).
- Google Medical Facility Search. 2021. www.google.com/. (Accessed September 2021).
- USA Cops – The Nation’s Law Enforcement Site. Accessed online at: <http://www.usacops.com/>. (Accessed September 2021).
- USA Fire and Rescue. Accessed online at: <http://www.usafireandrescue.com/> (Accessed September 2021).
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. “Adams County, Nebraska.” Accessed Online at: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?q=0500000US31001> (Accessed September 2021).
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. “Clay County, Nebraska.” Accessed Online at: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?q=0500000US08075> (Accessed December 2021).
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. “Colorado.” Accessed Online at: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?q=0400000US08> (Accessed September 2021).
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. “Franklin County, Nebraska.” Accessed Online at: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?q=0500000US31061> (Accessed September 2021).
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. “Jefferson County, Nebraska.” Accessed Online at: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?q=0500000US31095> (Accessed September 2021).
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. “Julesburg, Colorado.” Accessed

RESOURCE REPORT 5**Socioeconomics**

Online at: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?g=0600000US0811591900>.
(Accessed September 2021).

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. "Kearney County, Nebraska."
Accessed Online at: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?g=0500000US31099>
(Accessed September 2021).

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. "Kimball County, Nebraska."
Accessed Online at: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?g=0500000US31105>
(Accessed September 2021).

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. "Lincoln County, Nebraska."
Accessed Online at: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?g=0500000US31111>
(Accessed September 2021).

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. "Logan County, Colorado."
Accessed Online at: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?g=0500000US08075>.
(Accessed September 2021).

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. "Nebraska." Accessed Online at:
<https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?g=0400000US31>. (Accessed September 2021).

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. "Perkins County, Nebraska"
Accessed Online at: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?g=0500000US31135>
(Accessed September 2021).

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. "Saline County, Nebraska."
Accessed Online at: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?g=0500000US31151>
(Accessed September 2021).

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. "Sedgwick County, Colorado."
Accessed Online at: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?g=0500000US08115>.
(Accessed September 2021).

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. "Webster County, Nebraska."

RESOURCE REPORT 5

Socioeconomics

Accessed Online at: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?q=0500000US31181>
(Accessed September 2021).

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 2015-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. "Weld County, Colorado." Accessed Online at: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/profile?q=0500000US08123>.
(Accessed September 2021).