# E.3.14 Socioeconomics

## E.3.14.1 Environmental Setting

This 16.8-mile alternative would diverge from the Interstate 8 Alternative at MP 70.3 and would rejoin the Proposed Project at MP 114. Land uses along this alternative route would include grazing operations, Cleveland National Forest, open space, and rural residential in San Diego County. Demographics, housing, and public services and utilities providers information would be identical to the Proposed Project in San Diego County, which is described in Table E.3.14-1.

Table E.3.14-1. Demographic Characteristics – Route D Alternative

| Location | 2005 Estimated Population | 2005 Estimated Housing Units | 2005 Estimated Employment |
|---|---|---|---|
| San Diego County | 2,824,259 | 1,113,207<br>Vacancy Rate: 6.5%<br>(72,669 units) | Labor Force: 1,414,090 persons<br>Construction Occupations: 120,693 persons<br>Unemployed: 75,361 persons |
| San Diego Country Estates*<br>(San Diego County) | 9,262* | 3,102*<br>Vacancy Rate: 3.5%<br>(110 units) | Labor Force: 4,612* persons<br>Construction Occupations: 398 persons<br>Unemployed: 162 persons |

* Year 2000 Census data are presented, because 2005 American Community Survey (ACS) data are not available for this geographic location.
Sources: SDG&E, 2006a and U.S. Census 2000: 2005 American Community Survey, http://factfinder.census.gov accessed April 3, 2007.

While there is an existing 69 kV line in this area, that line passes through the center of several residential areas with insufficient space for a 500 kV transmission line. As a result, the line has been sited west of these areas and within a new transmission corridor. About two miles of the 500 kV line would still parallel the existing 69 kV line ROW.

Most of the area surrounding the alternative route is supplied by well water. Therefore, water for construction would be obtained from San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) territory and/or from El Capitan Reservoir or Lake Cuyamuca, both of which are nearby to the alternative route and are owned by the City of San Diego and the Helix Water District, respectively.

## E.3.14.2 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table E.3.14-2 summarizes the socioeconomic impacts of the Route D Alternative.

Table E.3.14-2. Impacts Identified – Alternatives – Socioeconomics

| Impact No. | Description | Impact Significance |
|---|---|---|
| Route D Alternative | | |
| S-1 | Project construction and/or transmission line presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments | Class III/IV |
| S-2 | Construction would disrupt the existing utility systems or cause a co-location accident | Class II/III |
| S-3 | Project construction and operation would increase the need for public services and facilities | Class III |
| S-4 | Property tax revenues from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Class IV |
| S-5 | Presence of the project would decrease property values | Class III |

Table E.3.14-2. Impacts Identified – Alternatives – Socioeconomics

| Impact No. | Description | Impact Significance |
|---|---|---|
| Central South Substation | | |
| S-1 | Project construction and/or transmission line presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments | Class III/IV |
| S-2 | Construction would disrupt the existing utility systems or cause a co-location accident | Class III |
| S-3 | Project construction and operation would increase the need for public services and facilities | Class III |
| S-4 | Property tax revenues from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Class IV |
| S-5 | Presence of the project would decrease property values | Class III |

Significance criteria for the SWPL alternatives are the same as for the Proposed Project (see Section D.14).

## Construction Impacts

### *Impact S-1: Project construction and/or transmission line presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments (Class III for business revenue, Class IV for economic benefits)*

**Revenue from Business Operations.** Business uses occur along the Route D route, but the project would not require the removal or relocation of any business uses. Impacts on local businesses would result from degradation of views, views of construction equipment and activity, vehicular or pedestrian access restrictions, land use, air quality, and noise effects, or health and safety concerns (such as EMF). These issues are analyzed in this document in Sections E.3.3 (Visual Resources), E.3.4 (Land Use), E.3.8 (Noise), E.3.9 (Traffic/Transportation), and E.3.10 (Public Health and Safety). Where impacts for these issue areas are found to be less than significant or have been mitigated to less than significant levels, any associated loss of local business revenue impacts would not be significant. In addition, because these impacts would be short-term construction impacts and no removal of businesses would be required, these impacts would not result in significant revenue impacts (Class III). Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are recommended outside of those presented in Sections E.3.3 (Visual Resources), E.3.9 (Traffic/Transportation), E.3.4 (Land Use), and E.3.10 (Public Health and Safety) to mitigate potential impacts that would result in a substantial change to local business revenues. See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.

**Economic Benefit.** Employment of construction personnel would be beneficial to local businesses and the regional economy through increased expenditure of wages for goods and services. Personnel for construction would be drawn from local populations in San Diego County, creating new temporary and permanent employment in these counties. A limited number of construction personnel would require temporary housing, likely in local hotels, and would purchase food, beverages, and other commodities, which would provide economic benefit to the local economy (Class IV).

### *Impact S-2: Construction would disrupt the existing utility systems or cause a co-location accident (Class II, Class III)*

Construction of tower foundations would not be within any roadways, thereby avoiding any utilities in roads. As discussed in Section E.3.14.3 below, the Central South Substation would encroach on a truck trail, but it is unlikely that utilities would be located in the private dirt roadway. However, about two

miles of the 500 kV line would parallel an existing 69 kV line ROW, causing the potential for an existing utility disruption in the event of an accident. Under PSU-APM-1, SDG&E would coordinate with all utility providers with facilities located within or adjacent to the project to ensure that design does not conflict with other utilities. With implementation of PSU-APM-2 (which has similar requirements to California Government Code §§4216-4216.9), Underground Service Alert would be notified a minimum of 48 hours in advance of earth-disturbing activities in order to identify any buried utility lines. Accidental disruptions would be low in this remote area with overhead construction. Compliance with the California Government Code §§4216-4216.9 (see Anza–Borrego Link impact discussion in Section D.14.5 for more detail) and APMs PSU-APM-1 and PSU-APM-2 would reduce the likelihood of accidental disruptions. Therefore, potential impacts related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

**Agricultural Lands**. The Route D Alternative would traverse Active Agricultural Operations (grazing operations) between MP 15 and 17.3. On off-road agricultural lands there is the potential to accidentally disrupt underground irrigation pipes during excavation or other ground disturbing construction activities (Class II). However, Mitigation Measure AG-1a, would require SDG&E to coordinate with property owners and tenants to ensure that project construction would be conducted so as to avoid interference with agricultural operations. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AG-1a would reduce impacts to Active Agricultural Operations and disruption to existing agricultural irrigation systems to less than significant levels. See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.

#### *Mitigation Measure for Impact S-2: Construction would disrupt the existing utility systems or cause a co-location accident*

**AG-1a Avoid interference with agricultural operations.**

#### *Impact S-3: Project construction and operation would increase the need for public services and facilities (Class III)*

Because construction activities and techniques would be the same as for the Proposed Project, water usage, solid waste generation, and public services requirements would be similar for this alternative on a per-mile/structure basis for overhead construction. Estimated water usage and solid waste generation for the Proposed Project is discussed in Section B (Project Description).

**Water**. In addition to water required for concrete, water would be used for dust control and tower construction. This quantity would be reduced with use of soil binders, as specified in Mitigation Measure AQ-1a in Section D.11 (Air Quality). Most of the area surrounding the alternative route is supplied by well water. Therefore, water for construction would be obtained from San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) territory, which supplies 97 percent of the water in San Diego County, and/or from El Capitan Reservoir or Lake Cuyamuca, both of which are nearby to the alternative route and are owned by the City of San Diego and the Helix Water District, respectively. As discussed for the Proposed Project, water use during project construction would be a comparatively small fraction of the total water supply for the jurisdictions affected by the Route D Alternative and would not change the ability of the water suppliers identified in Section D.14.2 in serving the alternative area demands (Class III).

Although the impact would be less than significant, to further reduce the impact reclaimed water would also be available in surrounding districts. There are 22 recycled water facilities within SDCWA's territory. SDG&E would have to contract with providers to obtain reclaimed water where it is available, and its use would reduce the amount of potable water needed from local water districts along the route.

With availability of soil binders (see Mitigation Measure AQ-1a), reclaimed water, and water from nearby districts, alternative means of procuring water and/or reducing water usage would be available in the event that local water suppliers are not able to supply the full amount of water required during construction in the summer months. Impacts to water supply would be less than significant. No mitigation is required; however, implementation of Mitigation Measure S-3b (Use reclaimed water), would further reduce impacts on local and regional water supplies by encouraging use of reclaimed water where possible.

**Solid Waste.** A percentage of excavated material would be clean and dry and would be spread along the ROW. Under this alternative there would be no structure removal. The closest two landfills along the alternative route would be the Ramona Landfill (20630 Pamo Road) that allows a maximum of 295 tons/day and has a remaining capacity of 690,000 cubic yards and the Sycamore Sanitary Landfill (8514 Mast Boulevard ) that allows a maximum of 3,965 tons/day and has a remaining capacity of 47,388,428 cubic yards. The Sycamore Sanitary Landfill accepts asbestos, contaminated soil, mixed municipal waste, sludge (biosolids), agricultural, dead animals, tires, shreds, and wood waste (including treated wood) (CIWMB, 2007).

Due to the number and capacity of landfills serving the alternative area, capacity for materials generated from construction would be available. Estimated solid waste generation for excavation and other construction activities is listed in Section B.4.9 (Removal of Facilities and Waste Disposal) for the Proposed Project. It is assumed that the Route D Alternative would generate a similar quantity solid waste on a per-mile basis. However, because there would be no removal of existing facilities and the route would be shorter overall (used in conjunction with the Interstate 8 Alternative), the total waste generation would be reduced. In addition, recycling activities would greatly reduce the quantity of construction-related materials transported to local landfills.

As the waste generated by construction would occur over an extended period and would be dispersed among the various landfills serving the entire project route, the daily waste exported off site would be a fraction of the maximum daily throughput for any of the landfills listed above and the landfills have adequate remaining capacity. The Sycamore Sanitary Landfill would accept any contaminated soil, if encountered. Therefore, construction waste generated by the Route D Alternative would not substantially affect the remaining capacities of local landfills to serve local demands (Class III). Although impacts to solid waste facilities would not be significant (Class III) and no mitigation is required, to further reduce adverse effects of the cumulative volume of waste, Mitigation Measure S-3a (Recycle construction waste) would be recommended for implementation to ensure that maximum recycling activities would occur.

**Fire Protection Services.** Any increase in potential fire hazards resulting from construction would increase temporary demands for fire protection services and is discussed in Section E.3.15 (Fire and Fuels Management).

See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.

***Mitigation Measure for Impact S-3: Project construction and operation would increase the need for public services and facilities***

**S-3a Recycle construction waste.**

**S-3b Use reclaimed water.**

## Operational Impacts

From an operational perspective, presence of the transmission line and associated facilities would not disrupt actual use of business properties or structures for the Route D Alternative. Access to all businesses would be fully restored once construction of the project is complete. The transmission line would be located near business properties, but it would not remove any businesses along the route or cause any use to change. In light of the aforementioned reasons, no business-related impacts would occur and there would be no substantial change in revenues during operation (Impact S-1). This operational impact is not discussed under each alternative.

Increased demands on emergency services would occur if operation of an alternative would increase the risk of wildland fires. Fire risk related to operation of transmission lines is discussed in greater detail in Section E.3.15 (Fire and Fuels Management) and is not addressed in this section. There is also the potential for a socioeconomic effect on local communities and other values at risk as a result of fire hazard, because a project-related fire or a fire that grows larger as a result of the presence of the project would have a significant effect on local communities. Cost of fire suppression is also discussed in Section D.15 (Fire and Fuels Management) and is not addressed here.

### *Impact S-3: Project construction and operation would increase the need for public services and facilities (Class III)*

During operation and maintenance, insulator washing, which would occur a maximum of twice a year, would require 300 gallons of water per structure along the length of the alternative route and 3,000 gallons of water per day. Similar to the proposed route, water would be trucked to the individual structures likely from the existing SDG&E Kearny O&M facility; however, compared to water usage during project construction and overall supply of surrounding suppliers/districts, water for washing would be minor and impacts on existing resources and suppliers would be less than significant (Class III).

### *Impact S-4: Property tax revenues from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies (Class IV)*

Local property tax revenues are a function of tax rates charged within the affected jurisdictions. Like with the Proposed Project, SDG&E's property taxes would increase as a result of the alternative route on private lands. Cleveland National Forest would receive no tax revenue from the installation of the project on Forest lands, because local tax revenues do not accrue on federal lands. However, CNF does collect fees annually for ROW Grants. An annual land use rent is determined from a Linear ROW Fee Schedule (inflation adjusted). The CY 2007 fee for an electric line ROW in San Diego County is $43.81 per acre of ROW per year (CNF, 2007a). Linear ROW fees go direct to the US Treasury's general fund. The alternative would not result in an adverse change in public resource revenue. Furthermore, the Route D Alternative would not preclude or limit the operations of any public agency or result in a change in revenue to any public agencies. Minor increases to public agency revenues as a result of the Route D Alternative are considered a beneficial (Class IV) impact. Therefore, no mitigation measures are recommended.

### *Impact S-5: Presence of the project would decrease property values (Class III)*

During the public scoping process for the Proposed Project, the public expressed a great deal of interest and concern regarding the potential impacts of transmission line projects on property values. As such, the discussion of Impact S-5 under the Imperial Valley link (see Section D.14.5.1) addresses in detail

the issues associated with the potential for impacts on property values and industrial facilities such as transmission lines in an effort to provide the reader with detailed background information based on extensive literature review and the property value issues of past similar projects. As also discussed in Section D.14.5, incremental effects on property values that may result from the changes resulting from this project would be very small, would diminish over time, and would be very difficult to quantify. Based on the studies discussed under Impact S-5 in Section D.14.5, it is concluded that the Route D Alternative would not generate effects that would significantly impact property values (Class III).

Although not required because the impact is less than significant, it should be noted that implementation of mitigation measures in the Visual Resources section (Section E.3.3), such as Mitigation Measures V-3a (Reduce visual contrast of towers and conductors) and other visual resources mitigation specific to Key Viewpoints, would help to reduce the visual impacts of the project, which is one of the components perceived to affect property values. See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.

## E.3.14.3 Central South Substation Alternative

The Route D Alternative would require construction of the Central South Substation Alternative in order to convert from 500 kV to 230 kV. This substation would be located on private land at the north end of the Route D transmission line segment and along the proposed route's 230 kV segment, west of the crossing of the San Diego River gorge. The substation site would encroach on an existing truck trail causing relocation of the trail, however, it is unlikely that utilities would be buried in the dirt roadway. Figure E.3.1-2 in Section E.3.1 illustrates the location of the substation.

Public services construction requirements would be similar to the proposed Central East Substation (see Section D.14.7), which is also located in a remote area. However, grading and earthwork would be reduced at the Central South Substation site as compared to the Central East Substation site, which likewise would reduce the overall water requirements for dust control. The socioeconomic, public services, and utilities setting and impacts of the Central South Substation would be identical to those discussed for the Route D Alternative (see Table E.3.14-2) due to its proximity to the route and similar environmental setting.

## E.3.14.4 Future Transmission System Expansion

For the Proposed Project and route alternatives along the Proposed Project route, Section B.2.7 identifies Future Transmission System Expansion routes for both 230 kV and 500 kV future transmission lines. These routes are identified, and impacts are analyzed in Section D of this EIR/EIS, because SDG&E has indicated that transmission system expansion is foreseeable, possibly within the next 10 years. For the SWPL alternatives, 500 kV and 230 kV expansions would also be possible. The potential expansion routes for the Route D Alternative are described in the following paragraphs.

### *230 and 500 kV Future Transmission System Expansion*

The Route D Alternative would begin at approximately MP I8-70 and would head northward until it reached the Central South Substation Alternative at approximately MP 114.5 of the Proposed Project. The Route D Alternative would convert to 230 kV at the Central South Substation and a double-circuit 230 kV line would be constructed southwest from that substation to the Sycamore Canyon Substation. The Central South Substation would accommodate up to six 230 kV circuits and an additional 500 kV circuit. Only two 230 kV circuits are proposed at this time, but construction of additional 230 kV circuits

and a 500 kV circuit out of the Central South Substation may be required in the future. There are two routes that are most likely for these future lines; each is addressed below. Figure E.1.1-6 illustrates the potential routes of the future transmission lines.

Additional 230 and 500 kV circuits could follow the Proposed Project corridor starting at MP 114.5. The routes could either: (1) follow the Proposed Project corridor southwest to the Chicarita Substation and then follow the Proposed Project's 230 kV Future Transmission Expansion System (see description in Section B.2.7) from Chicarita to the Escondido Substation; or (2) the Proposed Project northeast to the Proposed Central East Substation and then follow the Proposed Project's 500 kV Future Transmission Expansion route shown in Figure B-12b (see description in Section B.2.7). See Section D.14.2, D.14.7, D.14.8, and D.14.9 for the Socioeconomics, Services, and Utilities setting, impacts, and mitigation measures for the Central, Inland Valley, and Coastal Links of the Proposed Project. See Section D.14.11 for the Socioeconomics, Services, and Utilities setting, impacts, and mitigation measures for the Future Transmission System Expansion of the Proposed Project.