

## 4.19 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

### 4.19.1 Summary of Environmental Consequences

With the No Action Alternative, potentially significant environmental justice impacts could occur to low-income populations with the loss of service-industry jobs in the project area related to a decline in recreational use of the Sea.

With Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, submerged village sites may be affected by dredging activities, representing a disproportionate impact on a minority population (the Torres Martinez Band of Cahuilla Indians). No other significant disproportionate adverse environmental or human health impacts to low-income or minority population communities would occur with any other alternative. With restoration of the Sea, overall impacts to all populations, including minority and low-income populations, are expected to be beneficial.

### 4.19.2 Significance Criteria

The significance criteria are as follows:

- Does the potentially affected community include minority or low-income populations?
- Are significantly adverse environmental or human health impacts likely to fall disproportionately on minority or low-income populations?

Consideration of environmental justice issues is a federal requirement; there is no corresponding CEQA counterpart or significance criterion.

### 4.19.3 Assessment Methods

Environmental impacts discussed in previous sections have been evaluated to determine their significance and area of effect. Significant environmental justice impacts would result if these significant impacts cause disproportionate adverse environmental or human health impacts to low-income or minority population communities. The location of low-income and/or minority population communities near the Salton Sea was discussed in Section 3.18.

### 4.19.4 No Action Alternative

#### *Effect of No Action with Continuation of Current Inflow Conditions*

With the No Action Alternative, significant socioeconomic impacts are expected as a result of declining recreational and other economic uses of the Sea. Job losses would likely be in the service industry. Therefore, there may be a disproportionate adverse impact to low-income populations.

#### *Effect of No Action and Reduced Inflow Conditions*

The effect of the No Action Alternatives with reduced inflow conditions would be the same as the No Action Alternative with current inflow conditions.

#### 4.19.5 Alternative 1

##### *Effect of Alternative 1 with Current Inflow Conditions*

Impacts would not be significantly adverse or would be beneficial. The majority of the land required for this alternative would be in the Sea. Agricultural production in the region would not be affected. There would be some additional flooding of land within the Torres Martinez Reservation. However, this impact is not expected to be significant with mitigation. Economic impacts would be beneficial to the entire region, including low-income and minority communities.

##### *Effect of Alternative 1 with Reduced Inflow Conditions (1.06 maf/yr)*

The effects of reduced inflow conditions would be the same as for the current inflow conditions.

#### 4.19.6 Alternative 2

##### *Effect of Alternative 2 with Current inflow Conditions*

Approximately 1,200 acres of land within Riverside County and 3,000 acres of land in Imperial County would be acquired from the BLM or private landowners for this alternative. Private land would be acquired in-fee and no significant impacts to low-income or minority populations are expected. Other impacts related to this alternative would be the same as described for Alternative 1.

##### *Effect of Alternative 2 with Reduced Inflow Conditions (1.06 maf/yr)*

The effects of reduced inflow conditions would be the same as for the current inflow conditions.

#### 4.19.7 Alternative 3

##### *Effect of Alternative 3 with Current inflow Conditions*

Approximately 4,200 acres of land owned by the federal government would be converted for this alternative and no low-income or minority landowners would be affected. Other impacts related to this alternative would be the same as described for Alternative 1.

##### *Effect of Alternative 3 with Reduced Inflow Conditions (1.06 maf/yr)*

The effects of reduced inflow conditions would be the same as for the current inflow conditions.

#### 4.19.8 Alternative 4

##### *Effect of Alternative 4 with Current inflow Conditions*

Impacts related to this alternative would be the same as those described for Alternative 1.

***Effect of Alternative 4 with Reduced Inflow Conditions (1.06 maf/yr)***

The effects of reduced inflow conditions would be the same as for the current inflow conditions.

**4.19.9 Alternative 5**

***Effect of Alternative 5 with Current inflow Conditions***

Impacts related to this alternative would be the same as those described for Alternative 1.

***Effect of Alternative 5 with Reduced Inflow Conditions (1.06 maf/yr)***

The effects of reduced inflow conditions would be the same as for the current inflow conditions.

**4.19.10 Mitigation Measures**

Mitigation measures for impacts to Native American Resources are presented in Section 4.16. Mitigation measures for the loss of Indian Trust Assets are detailed in Section 4.17.

**4.19.11 Potentially Significant Unavoidable Impacts**

None.