

Section 3.12

3.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING

This section describes existing conditions and the potential population and housing impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Project and alternatives.

3.12.1 Existing Conditions**3.12.1.1 Current and Projected Population and Housing Trends**

Riverside County encompasses 7,207 square miles with a population density of 214 persons per square mile. Between 1990 and 2000, Riverside County experienced the fifth highest County population growth rate, 32 percent, compared to all 58 California Counties. Riverside County has experienced a high growth rate for the past 20 years, increasing 76.5 percent between 1980 and 1990. The purpose of the Proposed Project is to meet the forecasted electrical demand in the Electrical Needs Area and to improve electrical reliability and operational flexibility in this area. Elements of the Proposed Project would be constructed in the Cities of Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Redlands, and Yucaipa, as well as unincorporated areas of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties.

Population and housing data for the area was obtained from the United States Census Bureau (year 2000 Census) and the projected populations are based on data from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Table 3.12-1 identifies the population and demographic information for Riverside and San Bernardino Counties and the Cities of Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Yucaipa, and Redlands from the 2000 census.

Table 3.12-2 identifies the projected population growth for the Counties of Riverside and San Bernardino and the Cities of Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Yucaipa, and Redlands based on SCAG projections. As indicated in Table 3.12-2, the area in the vicinity of the Proposed Project is expected to have continued population growth in the future.

Table 3.12-3 identifies overall housing data for the Counties of Riverside and San Bernardino and the Cities of Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Yucaipa, and Redlands as obtained in the 2000 Census.

**TABLE 3.12-1
POPULATION AND DEMOGRAPHICS FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CITY OF
BANNING, CITY OF BEAUMONT, CITY OF CALIMESA, CITY OF YUCAIPA,
CITY OF REDLANDS, AND SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY**

	Riverside County	City of Banning	City of Beaumont	City of Calimesa	City of Yucaipa	City of Redlands	San Bernardino County
Population	1,545,387	23,562	11,384	7,139	41,207	63,591	1,709,434
One Race							
White	65.6%	64.2%	68.1%	89.1%	75.1%	73.7%	58.9%
Black	6.2%	8.5%	2.9%	0.6%	12.3%	4.3%	9.1%
American Indian and Alaska Native	1.2%	2.5%	2.3%	0.7%	0.9%	0.9%	1.2%
Asian	3.7%	5.4%	1.7%	1.1%	3.6%	5.1%	4.7%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%
Some Other Race	18.7%	14.9%	20.3%	5.4%	5.5%	11.3%	20.8%
Two or More Races	4.4%	4.4%	4.6%	3.1%	2.4%	4.4%	5.0%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)¹	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12.5%	24.1%	39.2%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data and Summary File 3 (SF 3) Sample Data, 2000

¹ The total number of Hispanic or Latino individuals is already accounted for in the One Race, or Two or More Races categories, and therefore, the percent of the total population for this category is not calculated.

**TABLE 3.12-2
PROJECTED POPULATIONS FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CITY OF
BANNING, CITY OF BEAUMONT, CITY OF CALIMESA, CITY OF YUCAIPA,
CITY OF REDLANDS, AND SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY**

	Riverside County	City of Banning	City of Beaumont	City of Calimesa	City of Yucaipa	City of Redlands	San Bernardino County
2000 Population	1,559,482	23,622	11,407	7,148	41,394	63,875	1,718,311
2005 Population	1,850,231	26,917	18,933	8,304	47,042	69,288	1,919,215
2010 Population	2,085,432	29,213	27,305	9,879	49,689	72,036	2,059,420

TABLE 3.12-2 (Continued)
PROJECTED POPULATIONS FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CITY OF BANNING, CITY OF BEAUMONT, CITY OF CALIMESA, CITY OF YUCAIPA, CITY OF REDLANDS, AND SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

	Riverside County	City of Banning	City of Beaumont	City of Calimesa	City of Yucaipa	City of Redlands	San Bernardino County
2015 Population	2,370,526	33,623	43,709	13,122	53,361	76,415	2,229,700
2020 Population	2,644,278	37,972	59,898	16,325	56,984	80,737	2,397,709
2025 Population	2,900,563	42,140	75,411	19,393	60,456	84,875	2,558,729
2030 Population	3,143,468	46,140	90,290	22,336	63,786	88,842	2,713,149

Source: SCAG City Projections (<http://www.scag.ca.gov/forecast/downloads/2004GF.xls>)

The population estimates for Riverside County, City of Banning, City of Beaumont, City of Calimesa, City of Yucaipa, City of Redlands, and San Bernardino County differ between the Census and SCAG due to the time of the year the estimates were made.

TABLE 3.12-3
HOUSING DATA FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CITY OF BANNING, CITY OF BEAUMONT, CITY OF CALIMESA, CITY OF YUCAIPA, CITY OF REDLANDS, AND SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

	Riverside County	City of Banning	City of Beaumont	City of Calimesa	City of Yucaipa	City of Redlands	San Bernardino County
Total Housing Units ¹	584,674	9,761	4,258	3,248	16,115	24,790	601,369
Occupied	506,218	8,923	3,881	2,982	15,193	23,593	528,594
Owner Occupied	348,532	6,426	2,097	2,474		14,259	340,933
Rented	157,686	2,497	1,784	508	3,896	9,334	187,661
Vacant	78,456	838	377	266	575	1,197	72,775
Single Unit	398,747	7,558 ¹	2,865	1,881 ²	10,212	16,783	442,954
Multiple Unit	103,066	1,028	1,046	120	1,282	8,007	116,581
Mobile	76,411	1,138	326	1,261	4,161	896	40,375
Boat, Van, RV, etc.	6,450	15	21	0	66	12	1,459
Homeowner Vacancy Rate	2.5%	3.5%	3.9%	3.0%	2.0%	2.2%	3.1%

TABLE 3.12-3 (Continued)
HOUSING DATA FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CITY OF BANNING, CITY OF
BEAUMONT, CITY OF CALIMESA, CITY OF YUCAIPA, CITY OF REDLANDS,
AND SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

	Riverside County	City of Banning	City of Beaumont	City of Calimesa	City of Yucaipa	City of Redlands	San Bernardino County
Rental Vacancy Rate	7.2%	8.6%	8.2%	10.0%	6.6%	5.0%	7.3%
Median Value	\$146,500	\$110,000	\$98,600	\$131,900	\$140,000	\$159,300	\$131,500

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data and Summary File 3 (SF 3) Sample Data, 2000

¹ When added together, the number of units by type (single, multiple, mobile or other) total does not equal the number of total housing units. This is the result of U.S. Census usage of a common weighted average applied to sample data, to determine the number of units by type.

3.12.2 Significance Criteria

Impacts to population and housing are considered potentially significant if the project 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)
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere

3.12.3 Proposed Project Impacts

3.12.3.1 Construction Impacts

Construction of the Proposed Project would require approximately 40 workers on a daily basis.¹ Construction activities would occur at various locations along the subtransmission line routes, fiber optic line routes, and substation sites over an approximate three-year period. SCE's own personnel and contractors (under the supervision of SCE personnel) would perform construction tasks required for the Proposed Project. This work force would consist primarily of local workers and workers that would commute to the various construction sites. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not increase the demand for housing in the project

¹ Most elements of the Proposed Project would require substantially less than 40 workers on a daily basis. However, for the purpose of a worst-case estimate, this analysis assumes that approximately 40 workers would be required in various locations if several elements of the Proposed Project are constructed concurrently.

area. If any non-local workers are employed, a temporary need for accommodations may arise. However, only a limited number of non-local workers would be employed, and these workers could be accommodated by hotels/motels located in the project area. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth in the area.

In addition, the Proposed Project would be constructed on either existing sites or sites where housing does not currently exist. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or displace substantial numbers of people.

In summary, project construction impacts related to population and housing would be less than significant.

3.12.3.2 Operational Impacts

As discussed in Section 1.0, the purpose of the Proposed Project is to meet the forecasted electrical demands of residents in the Cities of Banning and Beaumont, as well as surrounding unincorporated areas of Riverside County. As indicated earlier, all of the cities and counties in which the Proposed Project is located are projected to have continued population and housing increases over the next 25 years. SCE has identified the need for the Proposed Project to meet this continued growth in the area. In addition, the El Casco Substation and all other components of the Proposed Project would operate as unattended facilities, and only occasional maintenance or emergency repairs would be required. Therefore, the operation of the Proposed Project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth in the area. Additionally, the operation of the Proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people.

In summary, operation of the Proposed Project would not impact population and housing.

3.12.3.3 Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures

Because impacts to population and housing would be less than significant, no mitigation measures are required.

3.12.4 Alternatives

3.12.4.1 Northerly 115 kV Subtransmission Line Route Alternative

Activities associated with the construction of the northerly 115 kV subtransmission line route would occur within existing SCE easement corridors. In addition, the construction work force would consist primarily of local workers and workers that would commute to the construction sites. Finally, the northerly 115 kV subtransmission line would be unattended, and would only require occasional maintenance or emergency repairs. Therefore, the northerly 115 kV subtransmission line route would not induce substantial population growth,

either directly or indirectly, or displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people. In summary, impacts to population and housing due to the construction and operation of the subtransmission line route alternative would be less than significant.

3.12.4.2 Site 38 (Alternate Site)

Currently, the alternative substation location at Site 38 does not contain housing. In addition, the construction work force would consist primarily of local workers and workers that would commute to Site 38. The substation on Site 38 would operate as an unattended facility, and would only require occasional maintenance or emergency repairs. Finally, as with the Proposed Project, the substation would meet forecasted demand in the area. As a result, the Site Alternate would not induce population growth, either directly or indirectly, or displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people. In summary, impacts to population and housing due to the construction and operation of the substation at Site 38 would be less than significant.