D.11 Socioeconomics

This section addresses the environmental setting and impacts related to socioeconomics for the Proposed Project and alternatives. Specifically, this analysis evaluates the potential for any short- and long-term project-induced population, housing, and/or employment impacts.

D.11.1 Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project

As shown in Figures B-1 and B-2 and described in Section B.2.1, Project Location, the Proposed Project would be located in unincorporated San Luis Obispo County roughly 12 miles west-southwest of the City of San Luis Obispo, 10 miles southeast of the City of Morro Bay, 1 mile northwest of the community of Avila Beach, and approximately 8 miles south of the community of Los Osos. Shell Beach and Pismo Beach are approximately 5 and 7 miles southeast of the Proposed Project, respectively. Socioeconomic data for these areas were obtained from the 2000 U.S. Census, the California Employment Development Department, (EDD) and the California Department of Finance (DOF).

D.11.1.1 Population

Table D.11-1 presents recent population data and growth trends for the project area.

Table D.11-1. Population Characteristics and Growth Rates

City/County/Town	Population (1990)	Population (2000)	Percent Increase (1990–2000)
County of San Luis Obispo	217,162	246,681	13.6
Avila Beach (Census Tract 11600)	3,144	3,830	21.8
Los Osos (Census Tract 10701)	8,505	8,496	- 0.1
Morro Bay	9,664	10,350	7.1
Pismo Beach (includes Shell Beach)	7,699	8,551	11.1
San Luis Obispo	41,958	44,174	5.3

Sources: DOF, 2004; U.S. Census, 2004.
Note: The U.S. Census population of Pismo Beach includes Shell Beach.

D.11.1.2 Housing

Housing in the region includes single-family residences, apartments, condominiums, and mobile homes. Table D.11-2 presents housing data for the communities potentially affected by the Proposed Project.

Table D.11-2. Housing Characteristics*

Location	Total Housing Units (1990)	Total Housing Units (2000)	Percent Change (1990–2000)	Percent Vacant (2000)
County of San Luis Obispo	90,200	102,275	13.4	9.3
Avila Beach (Census Tract 11600)	1,515	1,793	18.3	9.4
Los Osos (Census Tract 10701)	3,379	3,378	0.0	4.8
Morro Bay	5,694	6,251	9.8	20.2
Pismo Beach (includes Shell Beach)	4,548	5,496	20.8	23.0
San Luis Obispo	17,877	19,306	8.0	3.4

*Totals include both occupied and unoccupied housing units
Sources: DOF, 2004; U.S. Census, 2004.

Morro Bay's high housing vacancy rate of over 20 percent is due to a large number of vacant seasonal, recreational, or occasional use units. Similar to Morro Bay, Pismo Beach and Shell Beach had a vacancy rate of 23.0 percent, with 1,041 units vacant for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use.

D.11.1.3 Employment

The workforce available to the Proposed Project includes local labor pools and specialized laborers that could temporarily relocate to the area. It is expected that local workers would be willing to make up to a one- to two-hour commute to the Proposed Project area. Counties within this commute range include Santa Barbara, Kern, Monterey, San Benito, and Kings Counties. The majority of the project-required labor force would be characterized by EDD labor force statistics as part of the "Construction" labor force. Those involved in transporting the RSGs would be categorized under the "Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities" labor force. Table D.11-3 provides labor force data for the "Construction" and "Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities" categories for the counties in the two-hour commute range.

Table D.11-3. Construction Labor Force Data for the Project Area and Nearby Communities

County	Total Civilian Labor Force	Civilian Unemployment	Construction Labor Force	Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities Labor Force
Kern	307,900	33,200	13,900	9,100
Kings	49,410	5,820	1,440*	760
Monterey	199,200	12,900	6,300	3,200
San Benito	30,730	2,250	1,630*	280
San Luis Obispo	123,300	3,800	6,800*	19,500
Santa Barbara	220,200	7,900	9,500	28,000

*Includes also Natural Resources and Mining employment
Source: EDD, 2004.

D.11.2 Applicable Regulations, Plans, and Standards

Federal and State Standards

There are no federal regulations, plans, or standards related to population, employment, or housing that are directly applicable to the Proposed Project.

The *CEQA Guidelines* in the California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15131 state the following:

- Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment.
- Economic or social factors of a project may be used to determine the significance of physical changes caused by the project.
- Economic, social, and particularly housing factors shall be considered by public agencies together with technological and environmental factors in deciding whether changes in a project are feasible to reduce and/or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

Local Ordinances and Policies

The County of San Luis Obispo has adopted a Local Coastal Plan and a Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance that include policies and standards for developing and maintaining affordable housing. These ordinances include incentives for developers to include affordable housing as part of development projects, guidelines for pricing of affordable housing, and requirements that the coastal zone must include affordable housing. None of these ordinances and policies, however, address the issues of providing temporary housing for laborers, and therefore, would not apply to the Proposed Project.

D.11.3 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

D.11.3.1 Definition and Use of Significance Criteria

Significant impacts to socioeconomics would potentially occur if the Proposed Project or alternatives would:

- Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure);
- Induce substantial population growth or the need for additional housing in an area due to the labor force required to implement the Project; or
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or persons necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

D.11.3.2 Replacement Steam Generator Transport

Based on the *CEQA Guidelines*, the discussion in this section focuses on project-related population, housing, or employment impacts that could potentially lead to physical environmental changes.

Population Growth

Transport of the RSGs would not result in population increase. Transport of the RSGs would require approximately 30 personnel for a period of 2 to 4 days during each year of deliveries (2007 and 2008). Due to the specialized nature of the transportation, it is anticipated that personnel would come from outside the two-hour commute area described above in Section D.11.1.3 and shown in Table D.11-3. It is expected that these workers for the transport phase would not stay for the duration of the entire Proposed Project. Any population increases due to workers coming from outside the commute area would be temporary. Therefore, there would be no permanent change to existing or future population growth levels as a result of offloading and transport activities. No impact would occur.

Housing and Labor Demand

As described in the Project Description in Section B.4.2 (Equipment and Personnel Requirements), approximately 30 RSG offloading and transport laborers may need to temporarily relocate to the project area. As shown in Table D.11-2, there is an adequate amount of vacant housing in the area. Therefore, demand for new housing is unlikely. Particularly, since transportation would take only 2 to 4 days per year, temporary accommodations would be available at the hotels and motels in the area. As a result, the

project would not lead to construction of any new homes, businesses, or infrastructure as a result of the demand for labor.

Replacement steam generator offloading and transport would require specialized, skilled positions contracted through a specific heavy transport company. Approximately 30 personnel would be required for up to 4 days for each of the unit deliveries (PG&E, 2004a). A small portion of these workers may be PG&E employees. As shown in Table D.11-3, counties within a two-hour commute range contain a skilled labor force with a sizable transportation workforce that would be able to meet labor needs for RSG offloading and transport. Given the substantial number of transportation workers within the commute area, RSG offloading and transport would not induce a substantial demand for labor. No impact would occur.

Population and Housing Displacement

Land uses near the offloading location at Port San Luis and along the transport route are primarily open space and agriculture within the DCPP owner-controlled area (OCA), with recreation and commercial uses at Port San Luis. No housing or residential areas would be displaced by transportation of the RSGs. A recreational vehicle camping area with a maximum 14-day stay is located at Port San Luis. Potential disruptions to recreation or tourism are addressed in Section D.8, Land Use and Recreation. Offloading activities at Port San Luis would occur for approximately two to four days, once between September and November of 2007 and once between September and November of 2008, at night, and outside the tourist season ~~and at night~~. Any necessary staging of the RSGs at Port San Luis would occur outside of County road ROWs, allowing for continued access to the Port (PG&E, 2004b). As described in Section D.8, Land Use and Recreation, impacts to established land uses would be considered adverse, but less than significant (Impact L-1, Class III) and impacts to recreational activities would be significant, but reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation (Impact L-2, Class II, Mitigation Measures L-2a and L-2b). However, the timing of offloading activities should minimize the impact of disruptions to Port San Luis businesses and fishermen. The transport route would not require the removal or relocation of any residential units or business uses, and no people or businesses would be displaced. No impacts would occur.

D.11.3.3 Replacement Steam Generator Staging and Preparation

Population Growth

Staging, preparation and construction of the RSG storage facility would require between 100 and 700 employees. As the steam generator replacement is scheduled to occur at the same time as the refueling and maintenance outage, the workers required for the steam generator replacement would be in addition to the ~~1,100~~ 1,285 temporary workers required for the refueling outage as described in Section B.4.2 of the Project Description (Equipment and Personnel Requirements). A small portion of these employees may be PG&E employees. As shown in Table B-2 of Section B (Project Description), the employees for staging and preparation activities would be needed for a period of 4 to 6 months (September to November 2007 through February 2008 in the case of Unit 2 and August to November 2008 through January 2009 for Unit 1) in addition to the duration of the generator replacement activities following staging and preparation. Although there would be approximately three months between the completion of activities in Unit 2 and the initiation of staging and preparation for Unit 1, personnel working on both projects could potentially remain in the area for over 18 months. It is anticipated that portions of the personnel would be drawn from the two-hour commute area described above in Section D.11.1.3 and shown in Table D.11-3. The remaining required personnel would be recruited from other parts of North America.

As with the transportation of the RSGs, it is expected that any workers from outside the commute area would stay only for the duration of the Proposed Project, and that no permanent change to population would occur. No impact would occur.

Housing and Labor Demand

Some of the workers required for staging and preparation would be from outside the two-hour commute range, and would require temporary housing accommodations. Although this would temporarily induce a demand for housing, the area has a strong vacancy rate and capacity for accommodating temporary populations. The large numbers of hotels, motels, and camping areas would accommodate the housing needs of temporary workers (PG&E, 2004a). Additionally, as shown in Table D.11-2, both Pismo Beach and Morro Bay have large percentages of vacant units that are primarily used for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use. The vacancy rates of Morro Bay, Pismo Beach, and the other locations listed in Table D.11-2 indicate that approximately 11,600 housing units are vacant and could potentially be used by temporary workers. Temporary housing in the areas surrounding DCPP would be able to accommodate the temporary workers required for project activities as well as temporary workers required for refueling outage activities during off peak tourist periods. No construction of new homes, businesses, or infrastructure would occur as a result of the demand for labor. No impact would occur.

Staging and preparation would induce a demand for skilled or semi-skilled labor positions, including general construction labor for construction and preparation of the RSG storage facility, temporary warehouse and laydown area, personnel training and mock-up facilities, office and subcontractor facilities, containment access facility, and the decontamination facility. Nuclear industry construction specialists would also be required for preparing and training for the replacement of the steam generators and storage of the OSGs. Construction laborers and required specialists can generally be drawn from the workforce within the two-hour commute range. As shown in Table D.11-3, San Luis Obispo and its surrounding counties contain a sizable construction labor force that provides adequate and available workers to accommodate the project. Even if all 700 employees required for staging and preparation would be drawn from the surrounding area, they would represent only 1.7 percent of the total construction workers in the area. Therefore, there would not be a substantial demand for labor resulting from project-related staging and preparation activities. No impact would occur.

Population and Housing Displacement

Temporary facilities to be constructed within the proposed TSA would be built on existing developed and disturbed property onsite (on the terrace south of the Access Road) and so would not displace any people or existing housing. Temporary workers from outside the area could potentially increase competition for hotels, motels, or short-term housing. As only approximately 100 workers would be required at the beginning of staging and preparation for Unit 2, beginning as early as September 2007, it is unlikely that temporary housing of these workers would conflict with demand for housing by tourists. Since the largest workforce would be needed in the fall and winter when tourism declines, an increased number of workers requiring temporary housing would not increase competition for temporary accommodations.

If temporary workers were to remain in the area between the completion of project activities on Unit 2 and the initiation of staging and preparation for Unit 1, there could be a potential increase in the need for temporary housing and accommodations. As described above, the cities and communities surrounding the project area have a substantial amount of temporary housing in the form of hotels, motels, campgrounds, and seasonal housing. The surrounding area is estimated to have approximately 11,600 vacant housing units. Workers staying through the summer of 2008 could potentially increase competition for

temporary housing with summer visitors to the area. However, given the abundant temporary housing available in the area, no substantial displacement of people or businesses would occur, and no new housing would need to be constructed. No impact would occur.

D.11.3.4 Original Steam Generator Removal, Transport, and Storage

The socioeconomic impacts of the removal, transportation, and storage of the OSGs would be similar to the impacts examined for staging and preparation as the labor force for the two phases would largely be the same, though the number of workers would be greater during this phase.

Population Growth

Activities associated with OSG removal, transportation, and storage are expected to require approximately 900 employees in addition to the ~~1,100~~1,285 temporary workers required for the refueling outage. A small portion of these employees may be PG&E employees. These employees would be needed for up to four months for each unit (February 2008 to May 2008 for Unit 2 and January 2009 to April 2009 for Unit 1). As described above for staging and preparation, personnel could potentially remain in the area during the break between refueling outages for Units 2 and 1 and could stay in the area for up to 18 months. As with staging and preparation, it is expected that any workers from outside the commute area would stay only for the duration of the Proposed Project, and that no permanent change to the area's population would occur. No impact would occur.

Housing and Labor Demand

Some of the 900 workers required for OSG removal, transportation, and storage would be drawn from within the two-hour commute range, while others from outside the area would require temporary accommodations. As described above, the area surrounding DCPP has a substantial capacity for accommodating temporary populations with a large number of hotels, motels, and camping areas (PG&E, 2004a). Similarly, approximately 11,600 vacant housing units in the surrounding area would be available for temporary workers. Temporary housing in the areas surrounding DCPP would be able to accommodate the temporary workers required for project activities, and no construction of any new homes, businesses, or infrastructure would occur as a result of project-related workers. No impact would occur.

OSG removal, transportation, and storage would induce a need for primarily skilled positions, although some semi-skilled positions may be required for construction of the OSG Storage Facility. Nuclear industry construction specialists would be required for the OSG removal, staging, and storage. Construction laborers and any required specialized labor can generally be drawn from the workforce within the two-hour commute range. San Luis Obispo and its surrounding counties contain a sizable construction labor force that would accommodate the project's demand for labor. Even if all 900 employees required for OSG removal, transportation, and storage were to be drawn from the surrounding area, they would represent approximately 2.3 percent of the total construction workers in the area. Therefore, there would not be a substantial demand for labor. No impact would occur.

Population and Housing Displacement

The OSG Storage Facility to be constructed as a part of this phase would be built on existing developed and disturbed property onsite. The Proposed Project would not displace any people or existing housing. As described for staging and preparation, temporary workers from outside the area could potentially increase competition for hotels, motels, or short-term housing. However, the cities and communities sur-

rounding the project area have a substantial amount of temporary housing in the form of hotels, motels, campgrounds, and seasonal housing to accommodate workers. No substantial displacement of people or businesses would occur, and no new housing would need to be constructed. No impact would occur.

D.11.3.5 Replacement Steam Generator Installation

The labor force for steam generator installation and return to service phase of the project would be the same total labor force identified for OSG removal, transportation, and storage because many of the activities in these two phases would be occurring at the same time. Consequently, the socioeconomic impacts from these activities would be similar to those identified for the previous phases.

D.11.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Alternatives

D.11.4.1 Replacement Steam Generator Offloading Alternative

Offloading and transporting the RSGs to DCPP by way of the Intake Cove would avoid any potential displacement or disruption impacts to Port San Luis businesses or fishermen. Impacts resulting from the temporary influx of workers for transportation of the RSGs to the TSA would remain largely the same as described above for the Proposed Project. As described in Section D.11.3.2 (Replacement Steam Generator Transport), transport of the RSGs by way of the Intake Cove is not expected to result in a permanent population increase. Labor demand impacts for the Intake Cove transportation route alternative would be the same as those for offloading and transport under the Proposed Project. Given the number of transportation workers within the commute area and the small number that would likely be drawn from this area, this alternative would not induce a substantial demand for labor. The induced demand for housing for the Intake Cove transportation route alternative would also be the same as those for transport under the Proposed Project. Particularly as transportation would take only 2 to 4 days per delivery, temporary accommodations would be available with hotels and motels in the area. No housing or residential areas would be displaced by transportation of the RSGs from this location, and no residential units or business uses would need to be removed or relocated. No impact would occur.

D.11.4.2 Temporary Staging Area Alternatives

Constructing and preparing the facilities at any of the TSA Location Alternatives would have socioeconomic impacts similar to locating the proposed TSA on the terrace south of the Access Road. The number of workers required for staging activities and the duration of activities would be the same as described for the Proposed Project. It is not expected that a permanent increase in population would result from staging and preparation of the RSGs at any alternative TSA location. It is anticipated that there would be an adequate available labor force to accommodate the project without inducing a substantial demand for labor and temporary housing in the areas surrounding DCPP. The potential for housing or population displacement would also be the same as for the Proposed Project. While workers staying through the summer of 2008 could potentially increase competition for housing with summer visitors to the area, with the amount of temporary housing available, no housing would need to be constructed. No impact would occur.

D.11.4.3 Original Steam Generator Storage Facility Location Alternatives

Construction and use of the OSG Storage Facility at any of the OSG Storage Facility alternatives would have similar socioeconomic impacts as described for Proposed Project. The number of workers required for project activities in this location and the duration of the activities would be the same as for the Proposed Project. Similarly, the induced demand for labor associated with construction and use of each OSG Storage Facility Alternative would be the same as described for the Proposed Project in Section D.11.3.4. Housing demand would be the same as for the Proposed Project. Temporary housing in the areas surrounding DCPP would be able to accommodate the temporary workers. Like the Proposed Project, each of the OSG Storage Facility alternatives would occur on existing developed and disturbed property onsite. The OSG Storage Facility alternatives would not displace any people or existing housing. While workers staying through the summer of 2008 could potentially increase competition for housing with summer visitors to the area, with the abundant amount of temporary housing available, no housing would need to be constructed.

D.11.4.4 Original Steam Generator Offsite Disposal Alternative

The disposal of the OSGs offsite would require fewer employees than what is required for the Proposed Project or the OSG Storage Facility alternatives, but impacts would be similar. Temporary workers would still be required for other portions of the steam generator replacement activities, and therefore, impacts would be similar to those described above for other alternatives. No long-term population growth would occur. Transportation workers would be required to dispose of the OSGs offsite, but with the region's transportation labor force, demand for labor would be easily accommodated. Because of the temporary nature of transporting the OSGs offsite, there would be no demand for new housing, and no people or housing would be displaced by the disposal of OSGs offsite.

D.11.5 Environmental Impacts of the No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative would cause DCPP to shut down prior to the expiration of its operating licenses in 2021/2025. The shutdown of the facility would cause the loss of jobs associated with DCPP operation. However, it is assumed that a good percentage of workers would be needed to decommission the facility at some point after shutdown.

Under the No Project Alternative, new generation and/or transmission facilities would be required in San Luis Obispo County, other parts of northern California, or the southern Central Valley to replace the electricity and transmission capacity currently provided by DCPP. While these facilities would be required to compensate for the lost electrical generation of DCPP, the location and development schedules of these new facilities cannot be predicted. The No Project Alternative would result in the loss of jobs at DCPP, because the operating life of the power plant may be shortened.

Construction of new generation or transmission facilities would require hundreds of temporary workers for each facility. Many workers would likely be drawn from local labor forces, depending on the level of skilled labor needed. It is likely that construction of new power plants and transmission lines would occur in areas with an adequate labor force within commuting distance. Due to the temporary nature of construction activities, it is unlikely that there would be an in increase population, demands on labor force, demand for permanent housing, or displacement of people or housing. Operation of new power plants could potentially increase local population levels by a few hundred residents or less, but could also potentially provide beneficial employment opportunities for these locations.

Alternative energy technologies could be used to make up replacement generation. However, it is not anticipated that the construction or operation of any facilities using these technologies would result in substantial long-term population growth, create a substantial demand for labor or housing, or displace people or housing. System enhancement options could also provide minor offsets to reduce the amount of replacement generation needed at the end of DCPP's operating life. However, similar to alternative energy technologies, system enhancements would not result in any significant socioeconomic impacts.

D.11.6 Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Table

Given that there are no potentially significant socioeconomics impacts resulting from the Proposed Project or alternatives, no mitigation measures would be required.

D.11.7 References

DOF (California Department of Finance). 2004. 1970-1980-1990-2000 Comparability File: Data File. http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/1970-1980-1990-2000%20Comparability%20File.xls. Accessed November 19.

EDD (California Employment Development Department). 2004. Monthly Labor Force and Industry Employment Data Release (Continued). http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/article.asp?PAGEID=&SUBID=&ARTICLEID=328&SEGMENTID=1. Accessed November 19.

PG&E (Pacific Gas and Electric Company). 2004a. Proponent's Environmental Assessment of the Diablo Canyon Steam Generator Replacement Project. Submitted to the California Public Utilities Commission. January 9.

_____. 2004b. Response of Pacific Gas & Electric to CPUC Deficiency Report. May 28.

U.S. Census (United States Census Bureau). 2004. American FactFinder. http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en. Accessed November 24.