

D.16 Social and Economic Conditions

This section addresses the potential effects on the social well-being and economic conditions that may occur with implementation of the Proposed PROJECT. Section D.16.1 provides a description of the environmental setting/affected environment. The applicable regulations, plans, and standards are introduced in Section D.16.2. An analysis of the Proposed PROJECT impacts/environmental effects and a discussion of mitigation are provided in Section D.16.3. An analysis of Proposed PROJECT alternatives is provided in Sections D.16.4 through D.16.7. Section D.16.8 provides mitigation monitoring, compliance, and reporting information. Section D.16.9 addresses residual effects and Section D.16.10 lists the references cited in this section.

D.16.1 Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

Methodology and Assumptions

This section presents demographic and socioeconomic data for communities in the project area, as well as the Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan wind energy project areas. Data used to assess social and economic conditions were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau, San Diego Association of Governments, the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), and the U.S. Department of Commerce. Pacific Wind Development's Environmental Document for the Tule Wind Project (Iberdrola Renewables, Inc. 2010a) and the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) and Proposed Land Use Amendment for the Sunrise Powerlink Project (CPUC and BLM 2008) were also reviewed. Additionally, portions of this section are based on the Public Scoping Report prepared for the Proposed PROJECT (CPUC and BLM 2010).

The Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan wind energy projects are being analyzed at a program level in this EIR/EIS as no site-specific survey data is available. Due to the close proximity of these wind energy projects to the East County (ECO Substation), Tule Wind, and Energia Sierra Juarez U.S. Generator-Tie (ESJ Gen-Tie) projects, a similar social and economic conditions setting is assumed.

D.16.1.1 General Overview

The Proposed PROJECT is located near the unincorporated communities of Jacumba and Boulevard in the rural Mountain Empire subregion of southeastern San Diego County. While the ECO Substation and ESJ Gen-Tie projects would primarily be located on undeveloped County of San Diego jurisdictional lands, the Tule Wind Project would primarily be located on Bureau of Land Management (BLM)-administered lands in the In-Ko-Pah Mountains, near the McCain Valley, north of Boulevard. In addition to Jacumba and Boulevard, the main population centers of the Mountain Empire subregion include the rural communities of Tecate, Potrero, and Campo.

The project area is located within the Mountain Empire census county division (CCD) area (referred to hereafter as the Mountain Empire subregion). CCDs are geographical statistical subdivisions of counties established cooperatively by the Census Bureau and officials of state and local governments in states where minor civil divisions (MCDs) either do not exist or are unsatisfactory for census purposes. Census Tract 211, which is geographically large and primarily undeveloped, consists of the same geographic area as the Mountain Empire subregion and contains the Proposed PROJECT. As a result, the Mountain Empire subregion data have been used as the primary geographic area for compiling demographic and socioeconomic data.

Population

The Mountain Empire subregion is characterized by its rural character, vast open spaces, natural resources, and scenic vistas. The area is defined by large-lot single-family residential development outside the community areas, limited commercial development, and undeveloped lands. Table D.16-1 shows recent population levels, growth rates, and population densities for the State of California; San Diego County and Imperial County; the cities of San Diego, El Centro, and El Cajon; and the Mountain Empire subregion. The population of the Mountain Empire subregion decreased by approximately 2% between 2000 and 2008. Home to approximately 6,354 residents in 2008, the rural Mountain Empire subregion is sparsely populated compared with the closest urban areas—El Cajon and El Centro. These cities are located approximately 50 miles from the project area.

Table D.16-1
Population Levels, Growth Rates, and Density

| Area | Population Levels | | Population Growth Rates | | Population/Square Mile | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| | 2000 | 2008 Est. | 2000–2008 | Average Annual Growth Rate | 2000 | 2008 Est. | Land Area (square miles) |
| California | 33,871,648 | 36,756,666 | 7.99% | 0.99% | 217 | 236 | 155,959 |
| San Diego County | 2,285,395 | 3,001,072 | 31% | 3.875% | 524 | 714 | 4,199 |
| San Diego (city) | 1,223,400 | 1,279,329 | 4.57% | 0.57% | 3,775 | 3,948 | 324 |
| Imperial County | 142,411 | 163,972 | 15.1% | 1.89% | 34 | 39 | 4,174 |
| El Centro (city) | 37,835 | 40,083 | 5.94% | 0.74% | 4,203 | 4,453 | 9 |
| El Cajon (city) | 94,864 | 92,718 | -2.2% | 0.275% | 6,324 | 6,181 | 15 |
| Mountain Empire Subregion | 6,485 ¹ | 6,354 ² | -2.02% | -0.22% | 14 | 14 | 450 |

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2010a

1. 2000 population level provided by San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG 2003)

2. 2008 population estimate provided by SANDAG (2009).

Housing

Table D.16-2 shows the quantity and value of housing stock available in the project area. As shown in this table, rental vacancy rates for the project area (within the Mountain Empire subregion) were not available from the U.S. Census Bureau or San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). However, the rental vacancy rates for urban areas relatively close to the project area are provided, and due to a greater number of housing units, these areas may be selected by temporary construction workers for housing during construction. Residential development in the Mountain Empire subregion is typified by single-family homes on large lots.

Table D.16-2
Housing Stock Characteristics (2006–2008)

| Area | Total Housing Units | Homeowner Vacancy Rate | Rental Vacancy Rate | Median Value (dollars) |
|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| California | 13,295,476 | 2.3% | 4.7% | \$510,200 |
| San Diego County | 1,132,383 | 2.9% | 4.9% | \$539,700 |
| San Diego (city) | 503,941 | 2.8% | 4.4% | \$550,300 |
| Imperial County | 53,241 | 4.4% | 6.2% | \$233,700 |
| El Centro (city) | 14,668 | 4.8% | 5.8% | \$240,000 |
| El Cajon (city) | 35,385 | 4.8% | 6.8% | \$438,900 |
| Mountain Empire Subregion | 2,673 ¹ | 17% ² | — ³ | \$125,163 ⁴ |

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2010b

1. Housing unit data (2006–2008) for these areas were not available from the U.S. Census Bureau. The 2009 estimate data available from SANDAG were used to populate this table.

2. Percentage is vacancy rate of all housing units in the area. Current estimates of vacancy rates provided by SANDAG.

3. Current rental vacancy rate for this area was not available from the U.S. Census Bureau. According to the Census 2000 Profiles prepared by SANDAG, in 2000 there were 663 rental units in the Mountain Empire subregion.

4. Median value for homes (2009) in this area was not available. These values are provided by Census 2000 Profiles for the specific subregional area as compiled by SANDAG (2003).

In addition to housing units, there are three motels in the general area, accessible from Interstate 8 (I-8): the Lux Inn (39739 Avenida de Robles Verdes, Boulevard), which consists of approximately 50 units; Pine Valley Inn (28940 Old Highway 80, Pine Valley), which consists of 24 units; and the Ayres Inn (1251 Tavern Road, Alpine), which consists of 99 units.

Economy

The following discussion highlights the distribution of employment by industry, incomes, and recent trends occurring in the project area.

Economic Conditions

The most comprehensive set of economic data generated by the BEA is available at the county level. Therefore, the following section includes economic profile information for San Diego

County rather than the Mountain Empire subregion. Data for 2007 are included since this year represents the most recent data available for personal income, employee compensation, and employment by industry. In 2008, San Diego County’s personal income was \$140 billion, and approximately 67% of personal income (nearly \$95 billion) was sourced from employee compensation. Personal income includes income “received by all persons from all sources” and is calculated as the sum of wage and salary disbursements, supplements to wages and salaries, proprietors’ income with inventory valuation and capital consumption adjustments, rental income of persons with capital consumption adjustment, personal dividend income, personal interest income, and personal current transfer receipts, less contributions for government social insurance (BEA 2009).

In 2008, the County’s total employment level was 1,920,205 (see Table D.16-3). Important employment industries within the County of San Diego include the retail trade; professional, scientific, and technical services; and health care and social assistance.

Table D.16-3
San Diego County, California Personal Income, Employee Compensation, and
Employment by Industry (2008)

| Industry | Personal Income (1,000s) | % of Total | Employee Compensation (1,000s) | % of Total | Employment | % of Total |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Total | \$140,846,916 | 100.0% | \$94,805,322 | 100.0% | 1,920,205 | 100.0% |
| Farm | \$281,314 | 0.2% | \$251,499 | 0.3% | 12,624 | 0.7% |
| Nonfarm | \$107,986,277 | 76.7% | \$94,553,823 | 99.7% | 1,907,581 | 99.3% |
| Total private | \$81,540,884 | 57.9% | \$68,108,430 | 71.8% | 1,564,119 | 81.5% |
| Forestry, fishing, related activities | \$87,288 | 0.1% | \$62,460 | 0.1% | 3,240 | 0.2% |
| Mining | \$63,811 | 0.0% | \$24,991 | 0.0% | 2,660 | 0.1% |
| Utilities | \$985,489 | 0.7% | \$939,981 | 1.0% | 7,192 | 0.4% |
| Construction | \$7,050,198 | 5.0% | \$5,203,894 | 5.5% | 107,246 | 5.6% |
| Manufacturing | \$9,412,270 | 6.7% | \$8,789,102 | 9.3% | 112,601 | 5.9% |
| Wholesale trade | \$4,367,435 | 3.1% | \$3,773,410 | 4.0% | 56,784 | 3.0% |
| Retail trade | \$6,391,434 | 4.5% | \$5,385,707 | 5.7% | 183,072 | 9.5% |
| Transportation and warehousing | \$1,420,406 | 1.0% | \$1,161,545 | 1.2% | 32,390 | 1.7% |
| Information | \$5,531,420 | 3.9% | \$5,278,224 | 5.6% | 45,887 | 2.4% |
| Finance and insurance | \$5,298,654 | 3.8% | \$4,348,069 | 4.6% | 83,094 | 4.3% |
| Real estate and rental and leasing | \$2,832,632 | 2.0% | \$1,619,071 | 1.7% | 112,935 | 5.9% |
| Professional, scientific, and | \$13,813,137 | 9.8% | \$11,074,728 | 11.7% | 187,836 | 9.8% |

Table D.16-3 (Continued)

| Industry | Personal Income (1,000s) | % of Total | Employee Compensation (1,000s) | % of Total | Employment | % of Total |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| technical services | | | | | | |
| Management of companies and enterprises | \$1,294,827 | 0.9% | \$1,308,597 | 1.4% | 16,445 | 0.9% |
| Administrative and waste services | \$4,432,419 | 3.1% | \$3,935,026 | 4.2% | 122,168 | 6.4% |
| Educational services | \$1,249,750 | 0.9% | \$1,191,774 | 1.3% | 37,086 | 1.9% |
| Health care and social assistance | \$7,936,672 | 5.6% | \$6,807,358 | 7.2% | 145,279 | 7.6% |
| Arts, entertainment, and recreation | \$1,488,715 | 1.1% | \$1,183,235 | 1.2% | 48,160 | 2.5% |
| Accommodation and food services | \$4,028,552 | 2.9% | \$3,602,731 | 3.8% | 148,734 | 7.7% |
| Other services except public administration | \$3,855,775 | 2.7% | \$2,418,527 | 2.6% | 111,310 | 5.8% |
| Government and government enterprises | \$26,445,393 | 18.8% | \$26,445,393 | 27.9% | 343,462 | 17.9% |
| Federal, civilian | \$4,277,828 | 3.0% | \$4,277,828 | 4.5% | 41,855 | 2.2% |
| Military | \$9,863,913 | 7.0% | \$9,863,913 | 10.4% | 111,510 | 5.8% |
| State and local | \$12,303,652 | 8.7% | \$12,303,652 | 13.0% | 190,097 | 9.9% |
| State government | \$2,678,655 | 1.9% | \$2,678,655 | 2.8% | 44,177 | 2.3% |
| Local government | \$9,624,997 | 6.8% | \$9,624,997 | 10.2% | 145,920 | 7.6% |

Source: BEA 2008a.

As indicated in Table D.16-4, the Mountain Empire subregion consists of a total employed population of 2,177. Within this population, the education and health industries account for 18.5% of the employment base, followed by construction at 13.0%. Other important employment industries within the Mountain Empire subregion include public administration, arts/entertainment/recreation, and manufacturing.

Table D.16-4
Mountain Empire Subregion Employment by Industry (2000)

| Industry | Employment | % of Total |
|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Education and Health | 402 | 18.5% |
| Construction | 282 | 13.0% |
| Public Administration | 274 | 12.6% |
| Arts, Entertainment, Recreation | 260 | 11.9% |
| Manufacturing | 200 | 9.2% |
| Retail Trade | 164 | 7.5% |
| Transportation | 155 | 7.1% |
| Professional Services | 150 | 6.9% |
| Other Services | 93 | 4.3% |
| Agriculture | 67 | 3.1% |
| Wholesale Trade | 59 | 2.7% |
| Finance | 51 | 2.3% |
| Information | 20 | 0.9% |
| Total | 2,177 | 100% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2010c.

Employment in the Boulevard community largely consists of residents in the following occupations:

- Telecommuters (working off site from their homes)
- Working for local educational facilities, law enforcement, and border security agencies, at local tribal gaming, entertainment, and other enterprises
- Operating small home-based cottage, art-related, bed and breakfast lodgings, or livestock and produce businesses.

Major industrial activities in the Boulevard area are restricted by limited and vulnerable groundwater resources, lack of extensive infrastructure, distance to urban areas, zoning and land use ordinances, as well as community preferences (County of San Diego 2010).

As discussed in Section D.5, Wilderness and Recreation, of this EIR/EIS, the Mountain Empire subregion contains a number of recreation areas that support active recreational uses, such as camping, mountain biking, rock climbing, off-roading, and wildlife viewing. Easy access to McCain Valley Resource Conservation Area and National Land Cooperative, other parks, protected and public lands, trails, scenic Historic Route 80, historic landmarks, Lark Canyon OHV (off-highway vehicle) Park and campgrounds, along with Boulevard’s dark skies and generally rural country roads, attract visitors and tourists. These unique resources provide a

tourism/recreation-based economy that helps support local businesses. Additionally, the San Diego Astronomy Association’s expanded Tierra Del Sol Observatory would continue to draw tourists, scientists, and researchers to the area.

Income Trends

Between 1990 and 2007, per capita income growth in San Diego County has outpaced the average per capita income growth experienced across the State of California. Table D.16-5 lists the average annual per capita income growth rate in the State of California and the annual per capita income growth rate in San Diego County between 1990 and 2007. As shown in Table D.16-5, the gap between the county and state average per capita income is widening; in 2007, San Diego County’s per capita income of \$44,430 was 106% of California’s per capita income of \$41,805.

Table D.16-5
Growth in Per Capita Income 1990–2007
State of California and County of San Diego

| Period | Per capita personal income (California) | Per capita personal income (San Diego County) |
|--------|---|---|
| 1990 | \$21,638 | \$20,852 |
| 1991 | \$21,750 | \$21,168 |
| 1992 | \$22,492 | \$21,831 |
| 1993 | \$22,635 | \$22,157 |
| 1994 | \$23,203 | \$22,687 |
| 1995 | \$24,161 | \$23,533 |
| 1996 | \$25,312 | \$24,846 |
| 1997 | \$26,490 | \$26,196 |
| 1998 | \$28,374 | \$28,490 |
| 1999 | \$29,828 | \$30,236 |
| 2000 | \$32,467 | \$32,793 |
| 2001 | \$32,901 | \$33,806 |
| 2002 | \$32,870 | \$34,642 |
| 2003 | \$33,620 | \$35,743 |
| 2004 | \$35,531 | \$38,567 |
| 2005 | \$37,418 | \$40,406 |
| 2006 | \$40,020 | \$42,721 |
| 2007 | \$41,805 | \$44,430 |

Source: BEA 2008b.

Unemployment Trends

The urban areas closest to the project area have been hit hard by the recession. The 2009 unemployment data for the cities of El Cajon and El Centro show that the unemployment rates in

those cities exceed County of San Diego and State of California rates. As shown in Table D.16-6, unemployment rates have not stabilized in the project area and in the State of California as a whole. Compared with the recession of 1990–1992, excluding the City of El Centro, the recent recession appears to have had a more severe effect because unemployment rates have peaked at higher levels.

Table D.16-6
Unemployment Rates, 1990–2009
County of San Diego, City of San Diego, El Cajon, and El Centro

| Period | County of San Diego (%) | State of California (%) | El Cajon (%) | El Centro (%) |
|--------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| 1990 | 4.6 | 5.8 | 5.6 | 24.7 |
| 1991 | 6.3 | 7.8 | 7.6 | 25.3 |
| 1992 | 7.3 | 9.4 | 8.8 | 30.0 |
| 1993 | 7.9 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 28.6 |
| 1994 | 7.1 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 25.5 |
| 1995 | 6.4 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 28.4 |
| 1996 | 5.4 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 29.0 |
| 1997 | 4.3 | 6.4 | 5.2 | 26.1 |
| 1998 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 4.3 | 25.2 |
| 1999 | 3.1 | 5.3 | 3.8 | 22.9 |
| 2000 | 3.9 | 4.9 | 4.5 | 16.4 |
| 2001 | 4.2 | 5.4 | 5.8 | 15.0 |
| 2002 | 5.2 | 6.7 | 7.1 | 14.1 |
| 2003 | 5.2 | 6.8 | 7.2 | 14.7 |
| 2004 | 4.7 | 6.2 | 6.6 | 16.1 |
| 2005 | 4.3 | 5.4 | 6.0 | 15.1 |
| 2006 | 4.0 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 14.5 |
| 2007 | 4.6 | 5.3 | 6.3 | 17.0 |
| 2008 | 6.0 | 7.2 | 8.3 | 21.6 |
| 2009 | 10.1 | 11.4 | 13.7 | 26.3 |

Source: BLS (Bureau of Labor Statistics) 2010.

D.16.2 Applicable Regulations, Plans, and Standards

This section discusses federal, state, and regional environmental regulations, plans, and standards applicable to the Proposed PROJECT, as well as the Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan wind energy projects. In addition to the federal regulations identified, the Campo and Manzanita wind energy projects may be subject to the Bureau of Indian Affairs’ (BIA’s) policies and regulations and tribe-specific policies and plans.

D.16.2.1 Federal Regulations, Plans, and Standards

National Environmental Policy Act

Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA, 42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), an EIS must include an analysis of the project's economic, social, and demographic effects related to effects on the natural or physical environment in the affected area, but does not allow for economic, social, and demographic effects to be analyzed in isolation from the physical environment. Section D.17 of this EIR/EIS addresses and analyzes any potential environmental justice concerns.

D.16.2.2 State Regulations, Plans, and Standards

Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Chapter 3, Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Article 9(a), Section 15131, states the following with regard to economic and social effects (14 CCR 15131):

(a) Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes.

(b) Economic or social effects of a project may be used to determine the significance of physical changes caused by the project. For example, if the construction of a new freeway or rail line divides an existing community, the construction would be the physical change, but the social effect on the community would be the basis for determining that the effect would be significant. As an additional example, if the construction of a road and the resulting increase in noise in an area disturbed existing religious practices in the area, the disturbance of the religious practices could be used to determine that the construction and use of the road and the resulting noise would be significant effects on the environment. The religious practices would need to be analyzed only to the extent to show that the increase in traffic and noise would conflict with the religious practices. Where an EIR uses economic or social effects to determine that a physical change is significant, the EIR shall explain the reason for determining that the effect is significant.

(c) 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 or avoid the significant effects on the environment identified in the EIR. If information on these factors is not contained in the EIR, the information must be added to the record in some other manner to allow the agency to consider the factors in reaching a decision on the project.

As stated previously, Section D.17 of this EIR/EIS addresses and analyzes any potential environmental justice concerns.

D.16.2.3 Regional Regulations, Plans, and Standards

County of San Diego General Plan

The following goals and policies of the existing San Diego County General Plan Land Use Element (County of San Diego 2003) and Energy Element (County of San Diego 1977) are relevant to analyzing how socioeconomic resources could be affected by implementation of the Proposed PROJECT:

- **Land Use Element Overall Goal:** Accommodate population growth and influence its distribution to protect and use scarce resources wisely; preserve the natural environment; provide adequate public facilities and services efficient and equitable; assist the private sector in the provision of adequate, affordable housing; and promote the economic and social welfare of the region
- **Land Use Element Goal 7.3:** Promote access to employment opportunities that minimize unemployment and return the maximum income to the residents of the region
- **Energy Element Goal 1:** Define and ensure adequate energy supplies for San Diego County
- **Energy Element Goal 2:** Encourage the utilization of alternative passive and renewable energy resources
- **Energy Element Goal 5:** Minimize economic or social impacts of energy supply and demand.

SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan

The following Regional Comprehensive Plan (SANDAG 2004) goals and policies are relevant to analyzing how socioeconomic resources could be affected by implementation of the Proposed PROJECT:

- **Public Facilities, Energy Objective:** Meet the region's energy needs in a fiscally and environmentally sound manner.

D.16.3 Environmental Effects

D.16.3.1 Definition and Use of CEQA Significance Criteria/Indicators under NEPA

Consistent with the requirements set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, social and economic effects are not treated as significant effects on the environment in this analysis and, therefore, no CEQA significance conclusions are presented for such effects. CEQA significance conclusions are, however, drawn for effects related to population and housing. Under CEQA, the Proposed PROJECT would be considered significant if it would:

1. Displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

NEPA provides no specific thresholds of significance for socioeconomic impact assessment. Significance varies, depending on the context of the proposed action (40 CFR 1508.27[a]), but 40 CFR 1508.8(b) states that indirect effects may include those that are growth inducing and others related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density, or growth rate. For the purposes of this analysis, the Proposed PROJECT would affect social and economic conditions if it would:

2. Cause a substantial change in revenue for local businesses, government agencies, or Indian tribes and cause a substantial change in local employment
3. Cause a substantial decrease in property values
4. Substantially benefit public agencies through property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence.

D.16.3.2 Applicant Proposed Measures

No applicant proposed measures (APMs) have been identified for the ECO Substation Project, Tule Wind Project, or the ESJ Gen-Tie Project related to social and economic conditions. At the time this EIR/EIS was prepared, the project proponents for the Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan Wind Energy projects have not developed project-specific APMs.

D.16.3.3 Direct and Indirect Effects

Table D.16-7 lists the impacts identified for the Proposed PROJECT, along with the classifications of impacts under CEQA or NEPA. Because Impacts SOC-2, SOC-3, and SOC-4 are not significance criteria under CEQA, these impacts are classified for NEPA as adverse, not adverse, or beneficial. Detailed discussions of each impact and the specific locations where each

East County Substation/Tule Wind/Energia Sierra Juarez Gen-Tie Projects
D.16 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

is identified are presented in subsequent sections. Cumulative effects analyzed in Section F of this EIR/EIS.

Table D.16-7
Socioeconomic Impacts

| Impact No. | Description | Classification |
|---|--|----------------|
| ECO Substation – Socioeconomic Impacts | | |
| ECO-SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | Class III |
| ECO-SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | Beneficial |
| ECO-SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | Not Adverse |
| ECO-SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |
| Tule Wind – Socioeconomic Impacts | | |
| Tule-SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | No Impact |
| Tule-SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | Beneficial |
| Tule-SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | Not Adverse |
| Tule-SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |
| ESJ Gen-Tie – Socioeconomic Impacts | | |
| ESJ -SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | No Impact |
| ESJ -SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | Beneficial |
| ESJ-SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | Not Adverse |
| ESJ-SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |
| Proposed PROJECT (COMBINED – including Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan Wind Energy) | | |
| SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | Class III |
| SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | Beneficial |
| SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | Not Adverse |
| SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect (Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)

Impact SOC-1: The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing.

ECO Substation Project

As indicated in Section B, Project Description (Subsection B.3.1.4), the rebuilt Boulevard Substation would be located immediately east of the existing substation on an 8.5-acre parcel recently acquired by SDG&E. Eight existing structures (one residence, a barn, a garage, and five other smaller structures) currently located on this parcel would be removed to rebuild the substation. As such, implementation of the ECO Substation Project would result in the displacement of an existing residence. However, the Mountain Empire subregion currently has a homeowner vacancy rate of 17% (refer to Table D.16-2). As a result, the displacement of one residence is not substantial, therefore, would not be adverse and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Tule Wind Project

The Tule Wind Project would not require the removal of any housing units or businesses. Although construction and decommissioning activities would temporarily affect traffic along local roadways, no homes would need to be removed or relocated. Therefore, no persons or housing would be displaced, and no replacement housing would be required. No impacts would result (No Impact).

ESJ Gen-Tie Project

The ESJ Gen-Tie Project would not require the removal of any housing units or businesses. Although construction activities would temporarily affect traffic along local roadways, no homes would need to be removed or relocated. Therefore, no persons or housing would be displaced, and no replacement housing would be required. No impacts would result (No Impact).

Proposed PROJECT

The Proposed PROJECT would result in the displacement of one residence; however, this impact would not be adverse given the availability of housing in the Mountain Empire subregion. Neither the Tule Wind Project nor the ESJ Gen-Tie Project would require the removal of any housing units or businesses. In addition, none of the proposed wind projects, Campo, Manzanita, or Jordan wind energy projects appear to significantly impact housing or cause displacement of substantial numbers of people or existing housing. Furthermore, these three wind projects would be built primarily on vacant areas of land. However, since details of project components are not

available at this time, the extent of the impacts to existing housing from these proposed wind projects is not known at this time but will be evaluated once sufficient project-level information has been developed. Although construction of the Proposed PROJECT would temporarily affect traffic along local roadways, no homes would need to be removed or relocated other than the one residence located on the Boulevard Substation rebuild site. Impacts would not be adverse and under CEQA would be less than significant (Class III).

Construction activities associated with the Proposed PROJECT would require the provision of temporary housing for construction workers. This housing would be available from existing hotels or motels, short-term rental of homes and apartments, or potentially trailers in trailer parks. This impact would be short-term in nature and can be accommodated with the existing housing available in the area. Similar impacts would also apply to the proposed Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan wind energy projects, none of which would require such an increase in construction personnel as to create a housing shortage or displacement of people or housing. It is anticipated that approximately ten permanent housing units would be required for the operating staff, which could also be accommodated by existing housing available. Since both temporary and permanent housing demand would be accommodated by the current housing available and would not require construction of new units, no adverse impact would occur (No Impact).

Impact SOC-2: Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment.

ECO Substation Project

Revenue from the ECO Substation Project

Construction of the ECO Substation Project is anticipated to require two years to complete and would require a workforce of 89 workers during peak construction activities. Construction labor would use local workers, and a majority of the subcontractors working on the project would also likely be local (SDG&E 2010). Additionally, where feasible, the ECO Substation construction workforce would be hired out of the local chapter of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW). Services would be provided by local contractors to the greatest extent feasible, and it is estimated that approximately \$36 million in local contracts would be awarded for this project (SDG&E 2010). Construction of the ECO Substation and associated components would require specialized transformers, steel structures, and other material that is not available locally. However, there are products and services that are available locally, and the project would use these resources to the greatest extent possible. It is expected that all of the concrete, sand, gravel, portable toilets, and other supplies would be purchased locally. This temporary increase in

employment and services would be a benefit to the region, especially in times of high unemployment.

Once completed, the ECO Substation Project would be integrated into San Diego Gas and Electric's (SDG&E's) transmission system and maintained by existing SDG&E personnel. Electrical supplies necessary to operate the ECO Substation Project and related projects would be available from SDG&E stock that is serviced by existing contracts. All substation monitoring and control functions would be performed remotely from SDG&E's central operations facilities. No new personnel would be required for operation and maintenance activities.

Revenue from Agricultural Operations

As discussed in Section D.6, Agriculture, of this EIR/EIS, most of the ECO Substation components would not be located on land that is actively being farmed. The only exception to this is the 138 kV Transmission Line component, which would traverse approximately 1,750 linear feet (0.3 mile) of Ketchum Ranch land that is actively being farmed with row crops, including organic lettuce (see Figure D.4-5b, ECO Substation Project Overhead 138 kV Transmission Line). Two transmission towers would be installed on this land. As discussed in Section D.6, Agriculture, construction and operation of the ECO Substation would not adversely affect agricultural operations and, therefore, revenue from agricultural operations.

Revenue from Other Business Operations

Near milepost (MP) 7.4, a private shooting and camping facility (the Lakeside Sportsmans Club) would be located some 2,400 feet south of the transmission line. Near MP 8.8, Lake Domingo would be located approximately 300 feet north of the transmission line (see Figure D.5-1, Wilderness and Recreation Overview Map). Additionally, the Chef Hat Grill, a small restaurant adjacent to Old Highway 80, is located approximately 1,000 feet to the west of the Boulevard Substation rebuild site.

During construction, visitors to these areas may be exposed to temporary increases in noise, dust, and odors from construction activities and equipment. Since construction vehicles would likely use the same roads as visitors to these areas, access and visitation to these areas could be temporarily reduced during construction. However, construction activities would be temporary at any given point along the proposed alignment, and all access to recreational facilities would be maintained throughout construction. In addition, exposure to temporary increases in dust and noise at these locations would be minimized by distance.

Overall Economic Impact

Employment of construction personnel would be beneficial to local businesses as well as the regional economy through increased expenditure of wages for goods and services. Construction

personnel would be drawn from local populations, creating both temporary and permanent employment in the community. Potential loss of revenue from agricultural operations and other business operations resulting from the construction and presence of the ECO Substation Project would be offset by the economic benefits resulting from project construction and operation; therefore, the project would be beneficial under NEPA.

Tule Wind Project

Revenue from the Tule Wind Project

Construction of the Tule Wind Project is anticipated to require 2 years to complete and would require an average daily peak workforce of 125 workers. It is estimated that approximately 60% to 70% of the site labor would be employed locally, and local construction expenditures are estimated to be \$3,407,000 (Iberdrola Renewables, Inc. 2010b). This temporary increase in employment and services would benefit the region.

Once completed, the Tule Wind Project would require up to 12 employees. These workers would be present on site during normal business hours and would work in the operations and maintenance (O&M) building. It is estimated that over \$2 million annually would be expended locally for O&M purposes, further benefiting the region by increasing local revenues and employment (Iberdrola Renewables, Inc. 2010b).

Revenue from Agricultural Operations

Currently, the only active agricultural activity within the project area is livestock grazing. As of September 2010 this use will no longer be allowed. BLM has determined that livestock grazing is not permitted within the Eastern San Diego RMP area. As discussed in Section D.6, Agriculture, of this EIR/EIS, construction, operation, and decommissioning of the Tule Wind Project would not adversely affect agricultural operations and, therefore, revenue from agricultural operations.

Revenue from Other Business Operations

As discussed in Section D.5, Wilderness and Recreation, of this EIR/EIS, access and visibility to recreation areas including the Lark Canyon OHV Area, Lark Canyon Campground, Cottonwood Campground, Carrizo and Sacatone Overlooks, and the BLM's Sawtooth Wilderness Area and Carrizo Gorge Wilderness Area would be adversely affected by construction, operation, and decommissioning of the Tule Wind Project, which in turn may adversely affect the local economy.

Overall Economic Impact

Employment of construction personnel would be beneficial to local businesses as well as the regional economy through increased expenditure of wages for goods and services. Construction and operational personnel would be drawn from local populations, creating both temporary and permanent employment in the community. Potential loss of revenue from business operations resulting from the construction and presence of the Tule Wind Project would be offset by the economic benefits resulting from project construction, operation, and decommissioning; therefore, the project would be beneficial under NEPA.

ESJ Gen-Tie Project

Revenue from the ESJ Gen-Tie Project

Construction of the ESJ Gen-Tie Project is anticipated to require 6 months to complete and would require approximately 20 to 25 workers per day for up to 6 months. It is estimated that between 27% and 53% of the site labor would be employed locally, and local construction expenditures are estimated to be \$162,420 (Sempra Global 2010). This temporary increase in employment and services would be a benefit to the region.

Once completed, the ESJ Gen-Tie Project would utilize one to two existing Sempra workers to patrol and visually inspect the gen-tie. Local expenditures of supplies and equipment during operations are estimated to be \$11,060 on a yearly basis (Sempra Global 2010).

Revenue from Agricultural Operations or other Business Operations

The ESJ Gen-Tie Project site and surrounding area do not contain any active agricultural operations or other sources of revenue and, therefore, would not adversely affect local agricultural or business operations.

Overall Economic Impact

Employment of construction personnel would be beneficial to local businesses as well as the regional economy through increased expenditure of wages for goods and services. Construction personnel would be drawn from local populations, creating temporary employment in the community. Since there would be no adverse impacts to other business operations, the project would be beneficial under NEPA.

Proposed PROJECT

The combined analysis of the three projects indicates that the ECO Substation and Tule Wind Projects would employ approximately 214 construction workers over a 2-year period, and the ESJ Gen-Tie Project would employ approximately 20 to 25 workers over a 6-month period.

Employment of construction personnel would be beneficial to local businesses and the regional economy through increased expenditure of wages for goods and services. The Proposed PROJECT would also result in the employment of up to 12 employees. Additionally, the Proposed PROJECT would result in local construction expenditures of approximately \$39.6 million, which would substantially benefit the local economy. Although, project-specific expenditures and number of employees are not available at this time, the proposed Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan wind energy projects would also increase local revenues and employment in the area. Less-than-significant impacts to agricultural operations and other business operations resulting from the construction and presence of the Proposed PROJECT would be offset by the economic benefits resulting from project construction and operation; therefore, the project would be beneficial under NEPA.

Impact SOC-3: Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values.

During the public scoping process for the Proposed PROJECT, the public expressed concern regarding the potential impacts of transmission lines, wind turbines, and other project facilities on their property values. The Final EIR/EIS for the Sunrise Powerlink Project (CPUC and BLM 2008) includes a literature review on property value impacts resulting from transmission lines. The review concludes that impacts on property values resulting from the visual impacts associated with transmission lines would not cause considerable property value change, and any changes in property values would not be a substantial decrease. As a result, impacts would not be adverse under NEPA.

Pacific Wind Development's Environmental Document for the Tule Wind Project (Iberdrola Renewables, Inc. 2010a) includes a literature review related specifically to the impacts of wind facilities on property values. The primary finding of this study was that there is insufficient evidence to suggest that property values near wind developments are affected by wind facilities, and if these impacts do exist, they are either too small and/or too infrequent to result in any widespread and consistent statistically observable impact (Iberdrola Renewables, Inc. 2010a). As a result, impacts would not be adverse under NEPA.

Impact SOC-4: Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies.

Operation of the Proposed PROJECT, including the proposed Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan wind energy projects would stimulate local businesses and the fiscal impacts created because part of the project would add to the County tax base throughout the life of the project. In addition, the Proposed PROJECT would contribute to personal income of landowners by providing additional income received from royalty payments through set lease agreements

between the individual landowners and developers. These community benefits from increased income would be widespread throughout the County and surrounding region.

Local property tax revenues are a function of tax rates charged within the affected jurisdictions. Property tax revenues in the Mountain Empire subregion are expected to increase as a result of the Proposed PROJECT. The State of California Board of Equalization (BOE) assesses infrastructure facilities annually. Dispersion of the property tax revenue caused by the Proposed PROJECT would be beneficial to the local economy because of tax revenue spending. Therefore, the Proposed PROJECT would neither result in an adverse change in public resource revenue, nor would it preclude or limit the operations of any public agency or result in a loss of revenue to any public agencies. Potential changes to public agency revenues would be positive and are considered beneficial under NEPA.

D.16.4 ECO Substation Project Alternatives

Table D.16-8 summarizes the impacts and classifications of impacts under CEQA or NEPA that have been identified for the different ECO Substation Project alternatives. These alternatives would not affect the impact conclusions resulting from implementation of the proposed Tule Wind and ESJ-Gen Tie Projects as described in Section D.16.3.3, Impact Analysis.

Table D.16-8
Socioeconomic Impacts Identified for ECO Substation Alternatives

| Impact No. | Description | Classification |
|---|--|----------------|
| ECO Substation Site Alternative | | |
| ECO-SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | Class III |
| ECO-SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | Beneficial |
| ECO-SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | Not Adverse |
| ECO-SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |
| ECO Partial Underground Proposed 138 kV Transmission Route Alternative | | |
| ECO-SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | Class III |
| ECO-SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | Beneficial |
| ECO-SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | Not Adverse |
| ECO-SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |
| ECO Highway 80 138 kV Transmission Route Alternative | | |
| ECO-SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | Class III |
| ECO-SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | Beneficial |
| ECO-SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | Not Adverse |

Table D.16-8 (Continued)

| | | |
|---|--|-------------|
| ECO-SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |
| ECO Highway 80 Underground 138 kV Transmission Route Alternative | | |
| ECO-SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | Class III |
| ECO-SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | Beneficial |
| ECO-SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | Not Adverse |
| ECO-SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |

D.16.4.1 ECO Substation Alternative Site

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

Section D.16.1 describes the environmental setting for the proposed ECO Substation Project. This alternative would result in a shift of the proposed ECO Substation site 700 feet to the east. As such, the environmental setting would be the same as that described in Section D.16.1.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect (Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)

Impact SOC-1 through Impact SOC-4: Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial beneficial change in local employment under NEPA.

While this alternative would result in physical changes associated with shifting the substation site, these physical changes would not result in any changes to the socioeconomic impacts analyzed under the ECO Substation Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3).

D.16.4.2 ECO Partial Underground Proposed 138 kV Transmission Route Alternative

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

With the exception of placing the proposed 138 kV transmission line underground between MP 9 and the rebuilt Boulevard Substation, components of this alternative would be the same as those identified for the ECO Substation Project. Under this alternative, from MP 9 to the rebuilt Boulevard Substation, the proposed 138 kV transmission line would be installed underground (instead of on overhead transmission poles) along the same route as the proposed ECO Substation Project. Since this alternative would follow the same route as the proposed ECO Substation Project, the setting would be the same as described in Section D.16.1.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect (Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)

Impact SOC-1: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to displacement of people and housing as those described under the ECO Substation Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). The displacement of one residence would not be adverse and, under CEQA, less than significant (Class III).

Impact SOC-2: Revenues from the project and agricultural operations would be the same as those analyzed in Section D.16.3.3. Impacts to revenue from other business operations would be slightly lessened, due to the decreased visual impact to visitors resulting from placing the line underground between MP 9 and the rebuilt Boulevard Substation. This less-than-significant impact to business operations resulting from the construction and presence of this alternative would be offset by the economic benefits resulting from project construction and operation; therefore, the project would be beneficial under NEPA.

Impact SOC-3: This alternative would result in a decreased impact related to property values for those homes located along the alignment between MP 9 and the rebuilt Boulevard Substation. These homes would no longer be subject to the visual impacts resulting from the presence of transmission lines, because these lines would be located underground in this alternative. As identified in Section D.16.3.3, transmission lines would not cause considerable property value change, therefore, other homes along the remainder of the alignment would continue to be subject similar affects under this alternative. As a result, overall impacts would not be adverse under NEPA.

Impact SOC-4: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to property tax revenues as those described under the ECO Substation Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). This would result in a beneficial impact under NEPA.

D.16.4.3 ECO Highway 80 138 kV Transmission Route Alternative

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

With the exception of the Old Highway 80 138 kV transmission line route alternative, the existing land uses adjacent to proposed project components of this alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed ECO Substation Project. From the intersection of the Southwest Powerlink (SWPL) transmission line and Old Highway 80 (approximately 1.5 miles northwest of Jacumba) this alternative would expand and utilize an existing utility right of way (ROW) and overbuild an existing distribution line for approximately 4.8 miles along Highway 80 to the rebuilt Boulevard substation. Approximately 44 rural residences adjacent to Old Highway

80 would be located within 1,000 feet of this alternative. An auto salvage yard and a closed motel and restaurant are located adjacent to Old Highway 80 along this segment.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect (Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)

Impact SOC-1: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to displacement of people and housing as those described under the ECO Substation Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). The displacement of one residence would not be adverse and under CEQA less than significant (Class III).

Impact SOC-2: Under this alternative, the 138 kV transmission line route would not be located in an active agricultural area; therefore, revenues from agricultural operations would not be impacted. Revenues from the project would not change under this alternative. Less-than-significant impacts to business operations (auto salvage yard and restaurant) resulting from the construction and presence of this alternative would be far outweighed by the economic benefits resulting from project construction and operation; therefore, the project would be beneficial under NEPA.

Impact SOC-3: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to property values as those described under the ECO Substation Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). Impacts would not be adverse under NEPA.

Impact SOC-4: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to property tax revenues as those described under the ECO Substation Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). This would result in a beneficial impact under NEPA.

D.16.4.4 ECO Highway 80 Underground 138 kV Transmission Route Alternative

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

With the exception of the Old Highway 80 underground 138 kV transmission line route alternative, the existing land uses adjacent to proposed project components of this alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed ECO Substation Project. From the intersection of the SWPL transmission line and Old Highway 80, this alternative would place the 138 kV transmission line underground adjacent to Old Highway 80 (expanding and utilizing an existing utility ROW) and would follow the roadway north and west to the rebuilt Boulevard Substation. Approximately 44 rural residences adjacent to Old Highway 80 would be located within 1,000 feet of this alternative. An auto salvage yard and a closed motel and restaurant are located adjacent to Old Highway 80 along this segment.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect (Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)

Impact SOC-1: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to displacement of people and housing as those described under the ECO Substation Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). The displacement of one residence would not be adverse and under CEQA less than significant (Class III).

Impact SOC-2: Under this alternative, the 138 kV transmission line route would not be located in an active agricultural area; therefore, revenues from agricultural operations would not be impacted. Impacts to revenue from other business operations would be slightly lessened, due to the underground placement of the transmission line for a portion of the alignment. Less-than-significant impacts to business operations resulting from the construction and presence of this alternative would be far outweighed by the economic benefits resulting from project construction and operation; therefore, the project would be beneficial under NEPA.

Impact SOC-3: This alternative would result in a decreased impact related to property values for those homes located along the underground portion of the transmission line alignment, adjacent to Highway 80, when compared with the ECO Substation Project. These homes would no longer be subject to the visual impacts resulting from the presence of transmission lines because these lines would be located underground in this alternative. As identified in Section D.16.3.3 transmission lines would not cause considerable property value change, therefore, other homes along the remainder of the alignment would continue to be subject to similar effects under this alternative. As a result, overall impacts would not be adverse under NEPA.

Impact SOC-4: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to property tax revenues as those described under the ECO Substation Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). This would result in a beneficial impact under NEPA.

D.16.5 Tule Wind Project Alternatives

Table D.16-9 summarizes the impacts and classifications of impacts under CEQA or NEPA that have been identified for the different Tule Wind Project alternatives. The Tule Wind Project alternatives would not affect the impact conclusions resulting from implementation of the proposed ECO Substation and ESJ Gen-Tie Projects as described in Section D.16.3.3.

Table D.16-9
Socioeconomic Impacts Identified for Tule Wind Project Alternatives

| Impact No. | Description | Classification |
|---|--|----------------|
| Tule Wind Alternative 1, Gen-Tie Route 2 with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch | | |
| TULE-SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | No Impact |
| TULE-SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | Beneficial |
| TULE-SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | Not Adverse |
| TULE-SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |
| Tule Wind Alternative 2, Gen-Tie Route 2 Underground with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch | | |
| TULE-SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | No Impact |
| TULE-SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | Beneficial |
| TULE-SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | Not Adverse |
| TULE-SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |
| Tule Wind Alternative 3, Gen-Tie Route 3 with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch | | |
| TULE-SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | No Impact |
| TULE-SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | Beneficial |
| TULE-SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | Not Adverse |
| TULE-SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |
| Tule Wind Alternative 4, Gen-Tie Route 3 Underground with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch | | |
| TULE-SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | No Impact |
| TULE-SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | Beneficial |
| TULE-SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | Not Adverse |
| TULE-SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |
| Tule Wind Alternative 5, Reduction in Turbines | | |
| TULE-SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | No Impact |
| TULE-SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | Beneficial |
| TULE-SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | Not Adverse |
| TULE-SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |

D.16.5.1 Tule Wind Alternative 1, Gen-Tie Route 2 with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

This alternative would relocate the O&M facility and collector substation to Rough Acres Ranch, extend the collector cable system, and shorten the length of the 138 kV gen-tie line, all within the Tule Wind Project site boundary. As such, the environmental setting would be the same as that described in Section D.16.1.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect (Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)

Impact SOC-1: This alternative would relocate the O&M facility and collector substation to Rough Acres Ranch. Rough Acres Ranch consists of duplexes and a larger lodge that would be leased to SDG&E beginning May 2010 for construction of the Sunrise Powerlink. This alternative would not displace the existing lodging facilities, and therefore, no impact would result (No Impact).

Impact SOC-2: While this alternative would result in physical changes associated with relocating the O&M facility and collector substation to Rough Acres Ranch, extending the collector cable system and shortening the length of the 138 kV gen-tie line, these physical changes would not result in any changes to the socioeconomic impacts analyzed under the Tule Wind Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3) and would be beneficial under NEPA.

Impact SOC-3: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to property values as those described under the Tule Wind Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). Impacts would not be adverse under NEPA.

Impact SOC-4: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to property tax revenues as those described under the Tule Wind Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). This would result in a beneficial impact under NEPA.

D.16.5.2 Tule Wind Alternative 2, Gen-Tie Route 2 Underground with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

This alternative would result in the underground placement of the proposed 138 kV gen-tie transmission line Route 2, from the alternate collector substation approximately 1 mile east, south along McCain Valley Road, and then west underground along Old Highway 80 until reaching the Boulevard Substation rebuild component of the ECO Substation Project. Project

components under this alternative would all be within the Tule Wind Project site boundary. As such, the environmental setting would be the same as that described in Section D.16.1.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect (Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)

Impact SOC-1: This alternative would relocate the O&M facility and collector substation to Rough Acres Ranch. Rough Acres Ranch consists of duplexes and a larger lodge that would be leased to SDG&E beginning May 2010 for construction of the Sunrise Powerlink. This alternative would not displace the existing lodging facilities; therefore, no impact would result (No Impact).

Impact SOC-2: Under this alternative, the entire 138 kV transmission line would be located underground. Impacts to revenue from other business operations would be slightly lessened, due to the underground placement of the transmission line; however, the wind turbines would still impact viewsheds and the overall recreational experience. Less-than-significant impacts to business operations resulting from the construction and presence of this alternative would be offset by the economic benefits resulting from project construction, operation, and decommissioning; therefore, the project would be beneficial under NEPA.

Impact SOC-3: As mentioned in Section D.16.3.3, the public has expressed concern regarding the potential impacts of transmission lines on their property values. This alternative would result in the underground placement of all 138 KV transmission lines; therefore, potential impacts to property values because of proximity to transmission lines would not occur. However, the wind turbines would remain but impacts would not be adverse. Overall impacts would not be adverse under NEPA.

Impact SOC-4: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to property tax revenues as those described under the Tule Wind Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). This would result in a beneficial impact under NEPA.

D.16.5.3 Tule Wind Alternative 3, Gen-Tie Route 3 with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

This alternative would relocate the O&M facility and collector substation to Rough Acres Ranch, extend the collector cable system and shorten and reroute the 138 kV gen-tie line primarily along Ribbonwood Road and Old Highway 80. These physical changes would take place all within the Tule Wind Project site boundary. As such, the environmental setting would be the same as described in Section D.16.1.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect (Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)

Impact SOC-1: This alternative would relocate the O&M facility and collector substation to Rough Acres Ranch. Rough Acres Ranch consists of duplexes and a larger lodge that would be leased to SDG&E beginning May 2010 for construction of the Sunrise Powerlink. This alternative would not displace the existing lodging facilities; therefore, no impact would result (No Impact).

Impact SOC-2: While this alternative would result in physical changes associated with relocating the O&M facility and collector substation to Rough Acres Ranch, extending the collector cable system, and shortening the length of the 138 kV gen-tie line, these physical changes would not result in any changes to the socioeconomic impacts analyzed under the Tule Wind Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3) and would be beneficial under NEPA.

Impact SOC-3: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to decreased property values as those described under the Tule Wind Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). Impacts would not be adverse under NEPA.

Impact SOC-4: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to property tax revenues as those described under the Tule Wind Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). This would result in a beneficial impact under NEPA.

D.16.5.4 Tule Wind Alternative 4, Gen-Tie Route 3 Underground with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

This alternative would result in the underground placement of the proposed 138 kV gen-tie transmission line Route 3. The proposed 138 kV transmission line would run underground from the alternate collector substation approximately 3 miles west to Ribbonwood Road, continue south along Ribbonwood Road, and then east underground along Old Highway 80, until reaching the Boulevard Substation. These physical changes would all take place within the Tule Wind Project site boundary. As such, the environmental setting would be the same as that described in Section D.16.1.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect (Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)

Impact SOC-1: This alternative would relocate the O&M facility and collector substation to Rough Acres Ranch. Rough Acres Ranch consists of duplexes and a larger lodge that would be

leased to SDG&E beginning May 2010 for construction of the Sunrise Powerlink. This alternative would not displace the existing lodging facilities or the people who would use these facilities; therefore, no impact would result (No Impact).

Impact SOC-2: Under this alternative, the entire 138 kV transmission line would be located underground. Impacts to revenue from other business operations would be slightly lessened due to the underground placement of the transmission line; however, the wind turbines would still impact viewsheds and the overall recreational experience. Less-than-significant impacts to business operations resulting from the construction and presence of this alternative would be offset by the economic benefits resulting from project construction, operation, and decommissioning; therefore, the project would be beneficial under NEPA.

Impact SOC-3: As mentioned in Section D.16.3.3, the public has expressed concern regarding the potential impacts of transmission lines on their property values. This alternative would result in the underground placement of all 138 KV transmission lines; therefore, potential impacts to property values resulting from proximity to transmission lines would not occur. However, wind turbines would remain but impact would not be adverse. Overall impacts would not be adverse under NEPA.

Impact SOC-4: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to property tax revenues as those described under the Tule Wind Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). This would result in a beneficial impact under NEPA.

D.16.5.5 Tule Wind Alternative 5, Reduction in Turbines

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

This alternative would result in a reduction in the number of turbines that would be located on the Tule Wind Project site. As such, the environmental setting would be the same as that described in Section D.16.1.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect (Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)

Impact SOC-1: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to displacement of people and housing as those described under the Tule Wind Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). No impact would result (No Impact).

Impact SOC-2: While this alternative would result in physical changes associated with a reduction in the number of turbines, these physical changes would not result in any significant changes to the socioeconomic impacts analyzed under the Tule Wind Project (refer to Section

D.16.3.3). While the construction schedule would likely be shorter under this alternative, employment of construction personnel would still be beneficial to local businesses as well as the regional economy through increased expenditure of wages for goods and services. Project-related revenues for the Ewiiapaayp Indian Reservation would be eliminated under this alternative due to the removal of all 17 turbines located on tribal lands. Additionally, project-related revenues for BLM, California State Lands Commission (CSLC), and the County of San Diego would be reduced due to the removal of 27 turbines located on BLM land, 7 turbines located on CSLC land, and 11 turbines located on County of San Diego land. Impacts to the revenues of these entities, as well as impacts to other business operations resulting from the construction and presence of this alternative, would be offset by the economic benefits resulting from project construction, operation, and decommissioning. Therefore, the project would be beneficial under NEPA.

Impact SOC-3: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to decreased property values as those described under the Tule Wind Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). Impacts would not be adverse under NEPA.

Impact SOC-4: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to property tax revenues as those described under the Tule Wind Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). This would result in a beneficial impact under NEPA.

D.16.6 ESJ Gen-Tie Project Alternatives

Table D.16-10 summarizes the impacts and classifications of impacts under CEQA or NEPA that have been identified for the different ESJ Gen-Tie Project alternatives. The ESJ Gen-Tie Project alternatives would not affect the impact conclusions resulting from the ECO Substation and Tule Wind Projects as described in Section D.16.3.3.

Table D.16-10
Socioeconomic Impacts Identified for ESJ Gen-Tie Project Alternatives

| Impact No. | Description | Class. |
|---|--|------------|
| ESJ 230 kV Gen-Tie Underground Alternative | | |
| ESJ -SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | No Impact |
| ESJ -SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | Beneficial |
| ESJ-SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | No Impact |
| ESJ-SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |
| ESJ Gen-Tie Overhead Alternative Alignment | | |
| ESJ -SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | No Impact |
| ESJ -SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, | Beneficial |

Table D.16-10 (Continued)

| | | |
|--|--|-------------|
| | tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | |
| ESJ-SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | Not Adverse |
| ESJ-SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |
| ESJ Gen-Tie Underground Alternative Alignment | | |
| ESJ -SOC-1 | The project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing | No Impact |
| ESJ -SOC-2 | Project construction and/or presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments and would cause a substantial change in local employment | Beneficial |
| ESJ-SOC-3 | Project construction and operation would cause a decrease in property values | No Impact |
| ESJ-SOC-4 | Property tax revenues and/or fees from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Beneficial |

D.16.6.1 ESJ Gen-Tie Alternative Undergrounding 230 kV Gen-Tie Transmission Line

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

This alternative would result in the underground placement of the 230 kV Gen-Tie Transmission Line. As such, the environmental setting would be the same as that described in Section D.16.1.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect (Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)

Impact SOC-1: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to displacement of people and housing as those described under the ESJ Gen-Tie Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). No impact would result (No Impact).

Impact SOC-2: Under this alternative, the entire 230 kV transmission line would be located underground. Impacts to revenue from agricultural operations and other business operations would not occur, aside from minor disruptions to recreational activities during construction activities. Following construction, viewsheds would be maintained, and recreational activities would be uninterrupted. Less-than-significant impacts resulting from the construction of this alternative would be offset by the economic benefits resulting from project construction and operation; therefore, the project would be beneficial under NEPA.

Impact SOC-3: As mentioned in Section D.16.3.3, the public has expressed concern regarding the potential impacts of transmission lines on their property values. This alternative would result in the underground placement of all 230 kV transmission lines; therefore, potential impacts to property values resulting from proximity to transmission lines would not occur. No impact would result under NEPA.

Impact SOC-4: This alternative would result in the same socioeconomic impacts related to property tax revenues as those described under the ESJ Gen-Tie Project (refer to Section D.16.3.3). This would result in a beneficial impact under NEPA.

D.16.6.2 ESJ Gen-Tie Overhead Alternative Alignment

This alternative would not affect the impact conclusions resulting from the implementation of the proposed Tule Wind Project as discussed in Section D.16.3.3. This alternative assumes the implementation of the ECO Substation Alternative Site and that the social and economic impacts identified in Section D.16.4.1 (ECO Substation Alternative Site) would occur.

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

This alternative would be similar to the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie project (the 500 kV or 230 kV gen-tie options) analyzed in Section D.16.3.3; however, shifted 700 feet to the east to connect with the ECO Substation Site Alternative (described in Section D.16.4.1). As such, the environmental setting would be similar as that described in Section D.16.1.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect (Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)

Impact SOC-1: Under this alternative, the transmission line would be shifted 700 feet to the east to connect with the ECO Substation Site Alternative. Impacts SOC-1 through SOC-4, as described in Section D.16.3.3, would be the same.

D.16.6.3 ESJ Gen-Tie Underground Alternative Alignment

This alternative would not affect the impact conclusions resulting from the implementation of the proposed Tule Wind Project as discussed in Section D.16.3.3. This alternative assumes the implementation of the ECO Substation Alternative Site and that the social and economic impacts identified in Section D.16.4.1 (ECO Substation Alternative Site) would occur.

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

This alternative would result in the underground placement of the 230 kV Gen-Tie Transmission Line to connect with the ECO Substation Site Alternative (described in Section D.16.4.1). As such, the environmental setting would be similar as that described in Section D.16.1.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect (Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)

Under this alternative, the entire 230 kV transmission line would be located underground to connect with the ECO Substation Site Alternative. Impacts SOC-1 through SOC 4, as described in Section D.16.6.1, would be the same.

D.16.7 No Project/No Action Alternatives

D.16.7.1 No Project Alternative 1 – No ECO Substation, Tule Wind, ESJ Gen-Tie, Campo, Manzanita, or Jordan Wind Energy Projects

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Impacts SOC-1 through SOC-4: Under the No Project Alternative 1, the ECO Substation, Tule Wind, and ESJ Gen-Tie, as well as the Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan wind energy projects, would not be built and the existing conditions would remain at these sites.

Social and economic impacts resulting from the Proposed PROJECT would not occur.

D.16.7.2 No Project Alternative 2 –No ECO Substation Project

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Impacts SOC-1 through SOC-4: Under the No Project Alternative 2, the ECO Substation project would not be built, and the conditions in the existing energy grid and local environment would remain. Planned generation facilities including the Tule Wind and ESJ Gen-Tie projects would require additional transmission and possibly multiple connection points to SDG&E's existing transmission system. The location of these transmission lines and connection points is not known at this time. From a socioeconomic perspective, this alternative would forego \$36 million in local expenditures, as well as decreased potential employment opportunities. However, the alternative would still result in an overall increase in employment and services.

D.16.7.3 No Project Alternative 3 –No Tule Wind Project

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Impacts SOC-1 through SOC-4: Under the No Project Alternative 3, the Tule Wind Project would not be built, and the existing conditions on the project site would remain. The ECO Substation and ESJ Gen-Tie projects would still be built under this alternative. From a socioeconomic perspective, this alternative would forego \$3.4 million in local expenditures

during construction and approximately \$2 million during operation, as well as decreased potential employment opportunities. However, the alternative would still result in an overall increase in employment and services.

D.16.7.4 No Project Alternative 4 – No ESJ Gen-Tie Project

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Impacts SOC-1 through SOC-4: Under the No Project Alternative 4, the ESJ Gen-Tie Project would not be built, and the existing conditions on the project site would remain. The ECO Substation and Tule Wind projects would still be built under this alternative; however, an additional transmission line to a different connection point would be required to connect the ESJ project to SDG&E's existing transmission system. The location of these transmission lines and connection points is not known at this time. From a socioeconomic perspective, this alternative would forego \$162,420 in local expenditures during construction and approximately \$11,060 during operation, as well as decrease potential employment opportunities. However, the alternative would still result in an overall increase in employment and services.

D.16.8 Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting

As described in Sections D.16.3–D.16.7, no adverse or significant socioeconomic impacts were identified; hence, mitigation measures are not necessary. Accordingly, no mitigation monitoring, compliance, or reporting is necessary for impacts to social and economic conditions.

The proposed Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan wind energy projects would require preparation of a mitigation monitoring, compliance, and reporting program following project-specific environmental review and evaluation under all applicable environmental regulations once sufficient project-level information has been developed.

D.16.9 Residual Effects

Since no adverse or significant socioeconomic impacts were identified in Section D.16, no residual impacts would occur for the Proposed PROJECT or alternatives.

D.16.10 References

14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendix A–L. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.

42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f. National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.

- BEA (Bureau of Economic Analysis). 2008a. United States Department of Commerce. Regional Economic Information System. Tables CA05N (Personal income by major source and earnings by NAICS industry), CA06N (Compensation of employees by NAICS industry), and CA25N (Total full-time and part-time employment by NAICS industry). Accessed online July 7, 2010, at: www.bea.gov/regional/reis.
- BEA. 2008b. United States Department of Commerce. Regional Economic Accounts, Interactive Chart (Per capita personal income, State of California and San Diego County: 1990–2007). Accessed online March 15, 2010, at: http://www.bea.gov/regional/REMDchart/default.cfm#chart_top
- BEA. 2009. United States Department of Commerce. Regional Economic Accounts, Regional Definitions, Personal Income (\$000). Accessed online March 15, 2010, at: <http://www.bea.gov/regional/definitions/>
- BLS (Bureau of Labor Statistics). 2010. Local Area Unemployment Statistics (County of San Diego, City of San Diego, El Cajon, El Centro). United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Accessed March 15, 2010, at: <http://data.bls.gov:8080/PDQ/outside.jsp?survey=la>
- County of San Diego. 1977. *County of San Diego General Plan - 1990, Part XI: Energy Element*. Adopted November 15, 1977.
- County of San Diego. 2003. *County of San Diego General Plan Part II: Regional Land Use Element*. Adopted January 3, 1979, amended December 10, 2003.
- County of San Diego. 2010. *County of San Diego Draft General Plan Update – Boulevard Subregional Planning Area*. Updated April 2, 2010.
- CPUC and BLM (California Public Utilities Commission and Bureau of Land Management). 2008. *Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Land Use Amendment: San Diego Gas and Electric Company Application for the Sunrise Powerlink Project*. Agoura Hills, CA: Prepared by Aspen Environmental Group for the CPUC and BLM. October 13, 2008.
- CPUC and BLM. 2010. *Public Scoping Report: Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement SDG&E East County Substation Project, Pacific Wind Development Tule Wind Project, and Energia Sierra Juarez U.S. Transmission, LLC, Energia Sierra Juarez Gen-Tie Project*. Encinitas, CA: Prepared by Dudek for the CPUC and BLM. March 2010.

- Iberdrola Renewables, Inc. 2010a. *Applicant's Environmental Document: Tule Wind San Diego County, California*. San Diego, CA: Prepared by HDR Engineering, Inc. September 2010.
- Iberdrola Renewables, Inc. 2010b. Tule Wind Project – Response to Data Request No. 1. March 18, 2010.
- SANDAG (San Diego Association of Governments). 2003. Profile Warehouse, 2000 Census Profile for Mountain Empire Subregion. Accessed online March 11, 2010: <http://profilewarehouse.sandag.org/>
- SANDAG. 2004. Regional Comprehensive Plan for the San Diego Region. Final approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors July 23, 2004.
- SANDAG. 2009. Profile Warehouse (Current Estimates) for Mountain Empire Subregion. Accessed online March 11, 2010, at: <http://profilewarehouse.sandag.org/>
- SDG&E (San Diego Gas and Electric). 2010. 3-19-10 Response to Data Request. SDG&E-ED-004: Q1-3.
- Sempra Global. 2010. Energia Sierra Juarez Gen-tie Project – Data Request No. 1. March 19, 2010.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2010a. American Population Finder. Data retrieved for State of California, County of San Diego, City of San Diego, Imperial County, El Centro, El Cajon. Accessed online March 15, 2010, at: <http://www.census.gov/>
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2010b. American Fact Finder, Selected Housing Characteristics 2006-2008. Data retrieved for State of California, County of San Diego, City of San Diego, Imperial County, City of El Cajon, and City of El Centro. Accessed online March 11, 2010, at: <http://www.census.gov/>
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2010c. American Fact Finder, Selected Economic Characteristics. Data retrieved for Mountain Empire CCD, accessed online April 27, 2010, at: <http://www.census.gov/>

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK