

C.8 SOCIOECONOMICS AND PUBLIC SERVICES

This chapter provides an update on socioeconomics and public services from that presented in the Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (FEIS/EIR) for the California-Oregon Transmission Project and the Los Banos-Gates Transmission Project (TANC/WAPA, 1988). The environmental setting of the Proposed Project area has changed since the publication of the FEIS/EIR because population has increased, so this SEIR presents updated data from the 1990 and 2000 Censuses. This chapter includes a general description of socioeconomic characteristics for the region, which include employment, labor force, and population and housing trends and public services available to the project area. A revised discussion of potential impacts is presented, as well as a new mitigation measure for the Proposed Project.

The methodology used for this analysis slightly differs from that used in the FEIS/EIR. The CPUC's General Proceeding (01-04-012) specifically addresses community values in its proceeding and decision, and it is not included in this analysis. In this SEIR, public services are addressed in this section, in addition to socioeconomics. Potential impacts to property value are addressed in Section C.7, Land Use and Recreation. This chapter also differs from the FEIS/EIR in that the SEIR presents a mitigation measure for potential fire risks.

This SEIR finds a preference for the Proposed Western Corridor over the Eastern Corridor Alternative with respect to socioeconomics and public services. The Eastern Corridor Alternative would have more impacts to business activity in terms of size of area affected, since the alternative traverses more agricultural areas. However, the Eastern Corridor Alternative is less susceptible to fire impacts since it is generally irrigated, and more accessible via county and farm roads. There is a greater fire risk in the Western Corridor.

C.8.1 ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE

C.8.1.1 Regional Overview

The Proposed Project or Alternatives could impact socioeconomics and public services in Merced, Fresno, and Kings Counties in the San Joaquin Valley. The cities included in this analysis are Los Banos, in Merced County, and Coalinga and Huron, in Fresno County.

Agriculture is Merced County's main source of revenue and the largest industry division in the county, followed by government and manufacturing. Approximately 92 crops are grown in Merced County in commercial quantities. More recently, the County has been trying to diversify and balance out its economy by expanding tourist trade and industry geared to agriculture-related products (State of California, 2001d).

Fresno County is the top producing farm county in the nation. Although agriculture laid the groundwork for the success of Fresno County, the labor force goes beyond the farm fields (State of California, 2001d). Fresno County offers an abundant labor force, inexpensive land and construction

costs, and a competitive cost of living which has enabled the County to accelerate growth in industries outside of agriculture (Fresno County, 2001).

Kings County is characterized by level farmland, the California Aqueduct, and a number of other irrigation waterways. Kings County ranks among the top counties in the nation in the production of cotton, barley, and alfalfa seed. Although a large percentage of the population in Kings County is employed in agriculture, there are a number of major non-farm employers, including Lemoore Naval Air Station, two state prisons, processing plants, and canning factories (Kings County, 1998).

A large portion of the reconductoring/realignment between Gates and Midway Substations (as described in Section B.2.1.4) is within Kern County. However, the socioeconomic and public services analysis does not include Kern County since this portion of the project is expected to involve very limited construction and it would occur entirely within PG&E's existing ROW.

C.8.1.2 Environmental Setting: Proposed Project and Alternatives

The socioeconomic characteristics analyzed for the region and project area include employment, labor force, and population and housing trends. The data presented is primarily from the 2000 U.S. Census, the California Department of Finance, and the California Employment Development Department. Information on public services was derived from planning department documents and websites, and communication with local agency representatives.

Employment

Table C.8-1 illustrates the available labor force and unemployment rates in the project area. Fresno County has a significantly larger construction labor force than the other two counties, which can be attributed to a larger population and total labor force pool. All three counties have relatively high unemployment rates at approximately 14 percent.

Table C.8-1 Employment: 2000

Location	Total Labor Force	Construction/ Mining Labor Force	Unemployment	Unemployment Rate
Merced County	85,2000	2,200	12,300	14.4%
Fresno County	398,600	16,900	56,300	14.1%
Kings County	45,880	1,030	6,420	14.0%

Source: CERES, 2001.

Population and Housing

Table C.8-2 illustrates the anticipated population growth in Merced, Fresno, and Kings Counties from 2000 to 2020. All three counties are estimated to grow by nearly 50 percent over the next 20 years.

Table C.8-2 Population Trends: 2000-2020

Location	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2000-2020 Growth %	2000-2020 Growth %
Merced County	210,554	239,900	266,700	292,400	322,700	112,146	53%
Fresno County	799,407	893,300	970,900	1,043,100	1,134,600	335,193	42%
Kings County	129,461	149,600	165,300	180,800	198,700	69,239	53%

Source: USBC, 2000 and State of California, 2001a.

Table C.8-3 provides some demographic information on Merced, Fresno, and Kings Counties, and the populated areas in close proximity to the Proposed Project and Alternatives. There are few significant differences in the socioeconomic characteristics between the cities and counties with the exception of the City of Huron in Fresno County, whose population is nearly 100 percent Hispanic.

Table C.8-3 Population, Race, Hispanic Origin: 2000

Location	Population	% White	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian/ Pacific Islander	% American Indian	% Other*
Merced County	210,554	40.6	3.6	45.4	6.8	0.5	3.1
- Los Banos	25,869	39.7	3.9	50.4	2.4	0.5	3.1
Fresno County	799,407	39.7	5.0	44.0	8.0	0.8	2.5
- Coalinga	11,668	43.3	2.2	49.9	1.8	1.0	1.8
- Huron	6,306	1.0	0.1	98.3	0.4	0.1	0.1
Kings County	129,461	41.6	8.0	43.6	3.1	1.0	2.6

Source: State of California, 2000.

* "Other" includes the population comprised of two or more races.

Table C.8-4 presents data on housing in income. There is no correlation between owner occupancy and median household income in the counties. With the housing vacancy rate relatively low and a doubling of the population over the next twenty years, new housing developments will likely occur in all three counties to support the growth.

Table C.8-4 Housing Characteristics: 2000

Location	Total Housing Units	% Owner - Occupied	% Renter - Occupied	% Vacant	Median Household Income
Merced County	68,373	59	41	7	\$29,178
- Los Banos	8,049	68	32	4	N/A
Fresno County	270,767	57	43	7	\$31,587
- Coalinga	3,848	58	42	9	N/A
- Huron	1,414	33	67	3	N/A
Kings County	36,563	56	44	6	\$30,577

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, 2001.

N/A: Not Available.

Public Services

Fire Protection. Wind, steepness of terrain, and naturally volatile vegetation can contribute to wildland fire hazard potential. Where there is human access to wildland areas, such as the Coast Range foothills, the risk of fire increases because of a greater chance of human carelessness. According to Fresno County, equipment operation is a major cause of wildland fires (County of Fresno, 2000).

State Responsibility Areas (SRAs) are areas of the state in which the financial responsibility of preventing and suppressing fires is primarily the responsibility of the State (*Public Resources Code* Section 4102). In most cases, the California Department of Forestry and Fire (CDF) is the state responsible agency for protecting SRAs. Many areas along the Proposed Project corridor are considered SRAs, with the exception of those lands under Federal jurisdiction (*Public Resources Code* Section 4127) and Segments 6 and 7 at the southern end of the corridor. Eastern Corridor Alternatives Segments 1, 2, 3, a portion of 4, and the majority of Segment 5 are also located in SRAs.

In addition to fire protection provided by CDF, counties in the project area can provide support or protection for non-SRAs. Fresno County is served by seven fire battalions with a total of 23 paid stations, not including volunteer stations. The City of Huron station has five permanent and five volunteer firemen. Harris Ranch Station has five assigned firemen and no volunteers. These two stations can serve any area in Fresno County. The Coalinga station is under the City's jurisdiction. There are 13 assigned firemen, including the Chief and his secretary, and 12 volunteer firemen. The Los Banos Fire Department in Merced County has seven paid personnel and 38 volunteer firemen. Kings County has a total of 11 fire stations, and the Cities of Hanford and Lemoore also have fire departments under their own jurisdictions.

Police Protection. The Merced County Sheriff's Department serves the County's police protection needs. There are four sheriff's stations and 6 CLEO stations throughout the County. The Proposed Project is served by Patrol Area 1 of the Fresno County Sheriff's Department. There are three police stations in Kings County: City of Hanford, City of Corcoran, and the City of Lemoore. The Kings County sheriff resides in the City of Hanford.

Schools. The Coalinga-Huron Joint Unified School District provides kindergarten through 12th grade education for the Coalinga-Huron region in Fresno County. The district has five elementary schools, one middle school, and three high schools. The district plans to obtain funding for two additional middle schools (County of Fresno, 2000). Merced County has six unified school districts, as well as 12 elementary school districts and three high school districts. Los Banos Unified School District provides kindergarten through 12th grade education for the City. The district has five elementary schools, two middle schools, and three high schools. Kings County has two unified school districts, 10 elementary school districts, and two high school districts.

Hospitals. The Coalinga Regional Medical Center is the only hospital in Coalinga and there are no hospitals in the City of Huron. Memorial Hospital is in Los Banos. There are three hospitals in Kings

County: Hanford Community Medical Center and Central Valley General Hospital in the City of Hanford, and Corcoran District Hospital in the City of Corcoran.

Water. The City of Los Banos has 13 active wells to serve the community. Both the Cities of Huron and Coalinga receive water from the California Aqueduct. The Kings, Tule, Kaweah, and Kern Rivers, as well as the California Aqueduct, provide water to Kings County. Approximately 32% of the water used by Kings County is obtained from groundwater.

Sewer. The incorporated areas of Coalinga and Huron, in Fresno County, are served by local sewer collection and treatment facilities. The City of Coalinga has a primary treatment plant on the southeast side of town near the confluence of Los Gatos and Warthan Creeks. The City of Huron has a primary treatment facility approximately one-half mile east of town on 9th Street. The City of Los Banos has a primary wastewater treatment plant. Each city within Kings County has its own sewage treatment plant.

Solid Waste. There are two existing landfills in Fresno County serving 6,000 square miles. The American Avenue Landfill is located at 18950 West American Avenue, in Kerman. It is a Class III landfill currently undergoing expansion (County of Fresno, 2000). The Coalinga Landfill is located at 30825 Lost Hills Road, in Coalinga. The western portion of Merced County is served by the Billy Wright Road Landfill and Dos Palos Transfer Station. The landfill and transfer stations are operated by the County of Merced Public Works Department. Kings County sends all its solid municipal waste to a section (Cell B19) of the Chemical Waste Management Center in Kettleman.

Natural Gas, Electricity, and Telephone. PG&E provides both gas and electric service to the majority of Fresno County, excluding the communities of Shaver Lake and Big Creek, which are served by Southern California Edison. Merced and Kings Counties' electrical and gas needs are also served by PG&E. Merced County's remaining electrical needs are provided by Merced Irrigation District (MID). Kings County's natural gas service is also provided by Southern California Gas. Telephone service in Fresno County is provided by Pacific Bell, Ponderosa Telephone Company, General Telephone Company, and Kerman Telephone Company. Pacific Bell is the primary telephone supplier in Merced County, further supplemented by two smaller existing phone companies, Continental Telephone and Livingston Telephone Company. Telephone service in Kings County is provided by both Pacific Bell and GTE.

C.8.2 APPLICABLE REGULATIONS, PLANS, AND STANDARDS

Following are General Plan goals and policies that apply to the Proposed Project or Alternatives.

Merced County

Goal 9: Accommodation of public land uses and private facilities that satisfy specific County needs.

Objective 9.A: Recreational areas, institutional and public facilities, hazardous and nonhazardous waste facilities, power and communication towers, and airports are appropriately located to minimize land use conflicts while satisfying local and regional demands.

- Policy 3: Public institutions and facilities should be efficiently located to provide the greatest level of service delivery while minimizing both public costs and impacts on adjacent properties.
- Policy 12: Structures that could impact air travel shall be reviewed for possible impacts.
 - Implementation: All proposed radio, television, power, or related transmission towers and lines shall be reviewed for appropriate location and possible air travel conflicts during the Conditional Use Application process. All applications will be referred to the Merced County Land Use Commission for comment.

Fresno County

Goal PF-J: To provide efficient and cost-effective utilities that serve the existing and future needs of people in the unincorporated areas of the county.

- Policy PF-J.1: The County shall encourage the provision of adequate gas and electric, communications, and telecommunications services and facilities to serve existing and future needs.
- Policy PF-J.2: The County shall work with local gas and electricity utility companies to design and locate appropriate expansion of gas and electric systems, while minimizing impacts to agriculture and minimizing noise, electromagnetic, visual and other impacts on existing and future residents.

Kings County

Objective 1.2: Avoid inefficient expansions of special district services by ensuring that development density is appropriate for the operation of an efficient system.

- Policy 1c: Assure that physical services and infrastructure will accommodate projected growth. Do not approve new development beyond the service capability of service providers.

Objective 1.4: Maximize cooperative planning and implementation of the General Plan through coordination with the cities and rural communities.

- Policy 1g: Periodically, but no less often than every five years and coordinated with the Housing Element Update, assess the remaining capacity of existing public services in relation to projected growth.

C.8.3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

C.8.3.1 Introduction

The evaluation of employment impacts is developed by collection of background employment trends in the project area, verification of PG&E's projections of construction labor force required, and assessment of the location and duration of construction employment generated by the project. Large construction projects can attract a new labor force to an area, which can be factored into temporary and permanent housing availability, and thus into demand for public services. Projections of direct project

impacts on public services are generated based on the nature of the activities as well as discussion with representatives of public service providers.

C.8.3.2 Definition and Use of Significance Criteria

The Proposed Project and Alternatives could affect socioeconomic conditions and public services both directly and indirectly. Construction and operation of the transmission line could create a direct demand for, or disruption to, public services along the alignment. The construction labor force could impact local employment patterns, population growth, and demand for housing. Acquisition of property could displace businesses and residents. These factors could have an indirect impact on public service demands. The operation of the facility could result in availability of new infrastructure in the area that could induce further employment and population growth, which would also directly impact need for public services.

Impacts of the Proposed Project or Alternatives on socioeconomic and public services would be considered significant if:

- A direct demand for, or disruption to, public services is created.
- The construction labor force impacts local employment patterns, population growth, and increases the demand for housing.
- Businesses or residents are displaced.

C.8.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures from 1988 FEIS/EIR

Table C.8-5 presents the socioeconomic and public services impacts identified in the 1988 FEIS/EIR, and then compares the impacts to those identified in this SEIR. There were two mitigation measures in the socioeconomic section of the original 1988 FEIS/EIR; however, these mitigation measures addressed property owners and right-of-way acquisition. These issues are addressed in Section C.7, Land Use and Recreation, and the mitigation measures are presented in Table C.7-2 in that section.

C.8.3.4 General Impacts

This section describes the general types of impacts that are evaluated for the Proposed Project and Alternatives. Section C.8.3.5 describes the specific locations along the Proposed Project and Alternative Corridors in which these impacts occur.

Socioeconomics

- **Impact 81: Temporary Employment.** The impact of the project on the construction period employment patterns could be beneficial or adverse. If unemployment in the region is reduced without causing a large influx of new employees into the region, it would be considered a beneficial impact (Class IV). If, however, labor shortages result in a competition for labor that drives up wage rates or an influx of workers who compete for existing housing, the employment impacts could be significant (Class I or Class II) adverse impacts.

Table C.8-5 Summary of Impacts: 1988 FEIS/EIR* and SEIR

FEIS/EIR Impact	Significance	SEIR Impact	Significance
Population	No impact.	Impact 8-1 , Temporary Unemployment	No impact.
Housing	No impact.	Impact 8-2 and 8-3 , Temporary and Permanent Housing	Beneficial impact
Economic impacts of project construction	Beneficial impact.	Impact 8-4 , Business in the Project Area	Beneficial impact with respect to construction crew spending, a less than significant with mitigation with respect to interruption of business practices, and a less than significant impact with respect to permanent loss of productive land.
Not addressed in FEIS/EIR.	Not applicable.	Impact 8-5 , Institutional activity	No impact.
Not addressed in FEIS/EIR.	Not applicable.	Impact 8-6 , Public protection	Less than significant.
Not addressed in FEIS/EIR.	Not applicable.	Impact 8-7 , Schools	No impact.
Not addressed in FEIS/EIR.	Not applicable.	Impacts 8-8 through 8-11 , Water, Wastewater, Solid Waste, Pipelines	Less than significant.
Community Values	No impact in a regional context and a beneficial impact in a local context.	Addressed in CPUC's General Proceeding	Not applicable.

- **Impact 82: Temporary Housing.** The impact on temporary housing would be considered significant if the demand for such housing takes up more than 25 percent of the supply of such housing that is utilized by the visitor market during the peak visitor season. If competition for temporary housing takes less than 25 percent of such supply, it would be considered less than significant (Class III). If temporary housing demand is such that it utilizes housing that is normally vacant during the peak season, it would be a beneficial (Class IV) impact.
- **Impact 83: Permanent Housing.** The impacts on permanent housing would be significant if demand for housing generated by project-induced immigration resulted in: a) increases in housing rent or prices by more than 10 percent; b) decreased vacancy rates to less than five percent; or c) decreased vacancy rates by more than 20 percent if already below five percent.
- **Impact 84: Business in the Project Area.** Project construction could impact businesses along the corridor by displacing them or by disrupting access and/or business activities. Any impact that causes the permanent displacement or relocation of a business would be considered a significant impact. A temporary business disruption would be considered a Class II (potentially significant but mitigable to less than significant) or Class III (less than significant) impact depending on the nature and extent of disruption. Businesses that sell supplies to the contractors or labor force could be beneficially impacted (Class IV).
- **Impact 85: Institutional Activity in the Project Area.** Project construction or operation could interfere with activities of governmental or nonprofit entities operating in the corridor. Any impact that causes the displacement of or interference with such activities would be a potentially significant (Class I or Class II) impact.
- Potential impacts on Property Values are addressed in Section C.7, Land Use and Recreation.

Public Services

- **Impact 86: Public Protection.** Impacts are considered significant if the project causes a temporary or permanent increase in need for police and fire protection personnel, or for equipment that is not matched by availability of such services and the financial resources to acquire such additional services.
- **Impact 8-7: Schools.** For schools with available capacity, any project-related temporary or permanent increase in enrollment that exceeds such capacity or results in the need to hire additional teachers or staff

would be considered significant. For schools with no reserve capacity, any project-related enrollment increase will represent an unavoidable significant (Class I) impact.

- **Impact 88: Water.** A significant impact would occur if the project or project-related growth would generate a demand that exceeds the ability of water utilities to supply the needed water.
- **Impact 8-9: Wastewater.** A significant impact would occur if the project or project-related population growth would result in wastewater flows that exceed the capacity of the collection and treatment facilities.
- **Impact 810: Solid Waste.** A significant impact on landfill capacity would occur if the project or project-related population growth would generate solid waste in excess of landfill capacity.
- **Impact 811: Pipelines and Existing Infrastructure.** A significant impact on infrastructure improvements would occur if the project or alternatives reduced the service life of an existing pipeline or other infrastructure.
- Potential impacts on roads are addressed in Section C.10, Transportation and Traffic.

C.8.3.5 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Proposed Project and Alternatives

This section discusses general socioeconomic and public services impacts or concerns that are not site-specific, but rather, would apply regardless of the route selected. The impacts of construction or operation and maintenance do not have different impacts based on particular corridors, so impacts of the Proposed Project and Alternative Corridors are covered in one section.

C.8.3.5.1 Construction Impacts

Socioeconomics

Construction of the Proposed Project or Alternatives would not have an adverse impact on employment, create a significant impact to permanent or temporary housing, or disrupt any businesses along the corridor.

Impact 8-1: Temporary Employment

According to the 1986 Draft EIS/EIR, a total of 280 construction workers would be working in the project area at any one time, and they would be dispersed among several locations. A maximum of 80 workers would be working on substation improvements and a maximum of 200 workers would be working on transmission line construction at stations along the corridor (see Figure B-8). Half of the work force would be expected to commute daily and the remainder would remain in the area Monday through Friday. Some of the daily commuters would likely be residents of the local impact area cities (TANC/WAPA, 1986). As discussed in Section B.3.4, construction crews are expected to come from within PG&E with an emphasis on use of workers from the local San Joaquin Valley Area. It is likely that 50 percent of the workers would come from outside the local area but would not be expected to permanently relocate their families. Transmission line construction would require the highest number of employees at one time, but because the transmission line construction period is only about 14 months long, that workforce would peak and decline rapidly (TANC/WAPA, 1986). Given the relatively high unemployment rates in all three counties and the large local labor force in the construction industry, there would be no adverse impacts to employment.

Impacts 8-2 and 8-3: Temporary and Permanent Housing

Even if the maximum number of construction crew members, a total of 280 people, were from outside the local project area and required temporary housing, the project would not have a significant impact on temporary housing. There are approximately 22 hotels and motels in the Cities of Los Banos, Coalinga, and Huron, and this estimate does not include lodging facilities in unincorporated areas of the county, specifically along Interstate 5 (CACC, 2001; City of Huron, 2001; Los Banos Chamber of Commerce, 2001). The impacts on hotels and other visitor-related services would represent a minor beneficial impact (**Class IV**). In addition, other major cities in the counties, such as Fresno and Merced, are within commuting distance to the project area.

Impact 8-4: Business in the Project Area

Most materials for the project, such as steel, wire, and substation components, would be purchased from vendors outside the project corridor. A limited number of local firms would benefit from selling consumable materials to the firms and crews working on the projects, and motels and restaurants would benefit from temporary increases in demand. This would be a minor beneficial impact (**Class IV**).

Construction of the transmission line could result in minor disruption of grazing, crop activity, and oil production along the Proposed Project and Alternative Corridors, but would result in a less than significant impact on employment or business activity with implementation of Land Use Mitigation Measures **L-6 through L-9 (Class II)**. Construction of the transmission line could also result in minor disruption to oil production activities along Western Corridor Alternative Segment 6B. Implementation of Hydrology Mitigation Measure **H-9** would require avoidance of active oil production facilities, resulting in a less than significant impact (**Class II**).

Construction of the transmission towers would result in the permanent loss of productive farmland. This impact is addressed in Land Use (Section C.7) and in Geology, Soils, and Minerals (Section C.5).

Impact 8-5: Institutional Activity

No residential, commercial, industrial, or institutional structures will be displaced as a result of the Proposed Project or Alternatives.

Public Services

The demand for public services, such as fire and police protection, schools, hospitals, and maintenance of public facilities, will not increase during construction of the project. PG&E will work directly with the County's Public Works Departments regarding construction schedules and work along roadways.

Impact 8-6: Public Protection

Construction of overhead transmission lines could generate risk of fire, particularly bird strikes or downed wires. In addition, operation of heavy equipment, particularly in the areas where dry grass is common, could be a possible source of fire resulting from the Proposed Project or Alternatives. Many

segments of the project are considered SRAs, which require CDF to provide fire protection to these areas. Those segments not within an SRA fall under county jurisdiction. There are fewer areas that would require county fire protection, and with available firemen in each county, there would be no impact to local fire protection.

Many parts of the project would be difficult to access by fire personnel and would make it necessary for the crews on site to have equipment and procedures in place to minimize the risk of fire and to quickly eliminate any small fires that might be started. This is considered a significant impact but could be mitigated to be less significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure **S-1 (Class II)**.

Electrical arcing from power lines can represent a fire hazard. This phenomenon is more prevalent for lower voltage distribution lines since these lines are typically on shorter structures and in much greater proximity to trees and vegetation. Fire hazards from high voltage transmission lines are greatly reduced through the use of taller structures and wider right-of-ways. Further, transmission line right-of-ways are cleared of trees to control this hazard. Fire hazards due to a fallen conductor from an overhead line are minimal due to system protection features. Overhead high voltage transmission lines include system protection designed to safeguard the public and line equipment. These protection systems consist of transmission line relays and circuit breakers that are designed to rapidly detect faults and cut-off power flow to avoid shock and fire hazards. This equipment is typically set to operate in 2 to 3 cycles, representing a time interval range from 2/60 of a second to 3/60 of a second. The operational fire risks are considered less than significant on public services (**Class III**).

The Proposed Project or Alternatives would not generate any direct impacts on police protection.

Mitigation Measure for Impact 8-6, Public Protection

S-1 PG&E shall submit a Fire Prevention and Suppression Plan (FPSP). The FPSP shall incorporate measures for prevention and suppression of fire on the ROW and on lands used or traversed by PG&E in connection with the project. The FPSP shall include a list of equipment required by all crews for extinguishing small fires that may be started during construction. PG&E shall provide training to project personnel regarding proper procedures on how to minimize the risk of fire and how to eliminate an existing fire. The FPSP shall be prepared in consultation with all appropriate counties, BOR, and BLM. PG&E shall consult with the California Department of Forestry and Fire for all land in the project area designated as State Responsibility Areas (SRAs). The FPSP will be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval prior to construction. Adherence to the Plan during construction will be monitored by a CPUC-approved construction monitor.

Impact 8-7: Schools

Since it is unlikely that construction of the Proposed Project or an Alternative would cause employees to relocate their families to the project area and increase the population, the project would not increase

enrollment at any local schools or result in the need to hire additional teachers or staff. There is no impact to schools in the project area.

Impacts 8-8 through 8-11: Water, Wastewater, Solid Waste, and Pipelines

Construction of a 500 kV transmission line and substation upgrade would not have a significant adverse impact on any local utilities in the project area. Along the proposed corridor, project construction could inadvertently contact underground facilities during construction of underground elements or the setting of new transmission poles, potentially leading to short-term service interruptions. A temporary impact to these services could occur, but this impact is less than significant due to its short-term nature **(Class III)**.

Water use during construction would be minimal and would be limited to dust control or other incidental uses. For the majority of the ROW, water would be need to be trucked to the point of use. PG&E has not stated the quantity of water needed for this project nor have they indicated a source, therefore the impact to the water supply can not be addressed at this time.

Project construction would result in an insignificant temporary increase in the total amount of waste generated in the region. Waste that is generated during construction will be disposed of in an environmentally responsible manner in one of the City or County landfills (see “Public Services” in Section C.8.1.2) and impacts would be less than significant.

C.8.3.5.2 *Operation and Maintenance Impacts*

No significant impacts to socioeconomics or public services would result during operation of the project. PG&E maintains transmission lines and substations on a regular basis, so there is no need for local government involvement in maintenance activities. Maintenance crews of fewer than 10 persons would use tools, trucks, assist trucks, aerial lift trucks, cranes, and other equipment necessary for repairing and maintaining insulators, conductors, structures, and access roads. PG&E maintenance crews would most likely be current employees that work on the existing transmission lines in the project area.

Operation of the project would not increase the demand for public water supply, nor would it jeopardize the water quality of the public water supply system. The only post-construction demand for water would be for intermittent domestic use by PG&E personnel.

C.8.4 MITIGATION MONITORING, COMPLIANCE, AND REPORTING TABLE

Table C.8-6 presents the mitigation monitoring program for socioeconomics and public services.

Table C.8-6 Mitigation Monitoring Program

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Location	Monitoring/ Reporting Action	Effectiveness Criteria	Responsible Agency	Timing
Proposed Project & Alternatives						
Construction activities are fire risks	<p>S-1: PG&E shall submit a Fire Prevention and Suppression Plan (FPSP). The FPSP shall incorporate measures for prevention and suppression of fire on the ROW and on lands used or traversed by PG&E in connection with the project. The FPSP shall include a list of equipment required by all crews for extinguishing small fires that may be started during construction. PG&E shall provide training to project personnel regarding proper procedures on how to minimize the risk of fire and how to eliminate an existing fire. The FPSP shall be prepared in consultation with all appropriate counties, California Department of Fire, and BLM. The FPSP will be submitted to the CPUC for approval prior to construction. Adherence to the Plan during construction will be monitored by a CPUC-approved construction monitor.</p>	All proposed and alternative segments	Submit Fire Prevention and Suppression Plan; Monitor compliance with Plan	No human-caused fires occur as a result of the construction of the Proposed Project or Alternatives.	CPUC	Prior to construction.

C.8.5 REFERENCES

CACC, 2001. (Coalinga Area Chamber of Commerce). *Telephone communication with Marylyn Gabriel*, August 7.

CERES, 2001. (California Environmental Resources Evaluation System). Economic and Demographic Information for all Counties, Economic Profiles provided by the Department of Finance, Webpage at: http://ceres.ca.gov/planning/counties/text_list.html.

City of Huron, 2001a. *Telephone communication with the City Office Receptionist*, August 7.

_____. 2001b. *Telephone communication with Leo Pasencia, Public Works Leadman*, August 7.

Coalinga Fire Department, 2001. *Telephone communication with Clint Meritaw*, August 1.

Coalinga Police Department, 2001. *Email communication with Chief Ed Landay*, May 24.

County of Fresno, 2000. The Revised Public Review Draft General Plan Background Report. Webpage at: http://www.fresno.ca.gov/4360/General_Plan/table%20of%20contents.html

Fresno County, 2001. Webpage at: <http://www.californiacv.com/Fresno.htm>.

Kings County, 1998. Kings County General Plan, originally published in December 1993 but amended February 10.

_____. 2001a. *Telephone communication with Fire Department Secretary, Kings County Government Center*, August 6.

_____. 2001b. *Telephone communication with Police Department Secretary, Kings County Government Center*, August 6.

Los Banos Chamber of Commerce, 2001. Demographic Information Sub-Page, Webpage at: <http://www.losbanos.com/demog1.htm>.

Los Banos Police Department, 2001. *Telephone communication with Denise Rocha*, August 1.

Los Banos Fire Department, 2001. Webpage at: <http://www.losbanos.org/departments/fire/presonnel.htm>.

State of California, 2001a. Department of Finance, Interim County Population Projections. Sacramento, California, June.

_____. 2001b. Department of Finance, *City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 2000 and 2001*. Sacramento, California, July.

_____. 2001c. Employment Development Department: Labor Market Information Division, *Labor Force Data for Sub-County Areas*. Sacramento, California, July.

_____. 2001d. Employment Development Department: *County Snapshot, Fresno and Merced Counties*, Sacramento, California.

_____. 2000. Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, California Census Data Center, Census 2000 (PL94-171) Population by Race/Ethnicity Incorporated Cities by County.

TANC/WAPA (Transmission Agency of Northern California and Western Area Power Administration). 1986. Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report for the California -Oregon Transmission Project and the Los Banos-Gates Transmission Project. November

USBC, 2001. (United States Bureau of the Census). Census of Population and Housing. Webpage at: <http://www.census.gov/>.

U.S. Department of Commerce, 2001. Economics and Statistics Administration: U.S. Census Bureau, *Profiles of General Demographic Characteristics 2000: 2000 Census of Population and Housing California*, May.