

E.2.14 Socioeconomics

E.2.14.1 Environmental Setting

The BCD Alternative would diverge from the Interstate 8 Alternative between MP I8-39 and I8-40, traversing north between the Carrizo Gorge Wilderness and Campo Reservation, then turning west and traversing near the Manzanita Reservation border before entering Cleveland National Forest land. This alternative would rejoin the Interstate 8 Alternative at its MP 58. The alternative route would be approximately 19.5 miles long. Jurisdictions along this alternative route include U.S. Forest Service, Caltrans, Department of Corrections, and County of San Diego.

Demographics, housing, and public services and utility providers information would be the same as the Proposed Project in San Diego County, which is described in Section D.14.2. The BCD Alternative would not parallel or cross any existing transmission lines. Most of the area surrounding the alternative route is supplied by well water. Water for construction would be obtained from San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) and/or from Barrett Lake or Morena Reservoir, both of which are nearby to the alternative route and are owned by the City of San Diego.

E.2.14.2 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section presents a discussion of impacts and mitigation measures for the BCD Alternative as a result of construction, operation, and maintenance of the project. Significance criteria for the SWPL alternatives are identical to the Proposed Project (see Section D.14). Table E.2.14-1 summarizes the impacts of the BCD Alternative for socioeconomics.

Table E.2.14-1. Impacts Identified – Alternatives – Socioeconomics

Impact No.	Description	Impact Significance
Route BCD Alternative and BCD South Option		
S-1	Project construction and/or transmission line presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments	Class II/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

Construction Impacts

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

Revenue from Business Operations. Business uses occur along the BCD 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.2.3 (Visual Resources), E.2.4 (Land Use), E.2.8

(Noise), E.2.9 (Traffic/Transportation), and E.2.10 (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). See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.

However, because this area of CNF has been developed for recreational use, negative impacts on the recreational experience in CNF would potentially result in lost revenue to CNF Descanso Ranger District due to the collection of fewer recreation and parking fees and camping fees at campgrounds, such as Cibbets Flat Campground, located one mile south of MP BCD-17 (Class II). Cibbets Flat Campground, which is along the Pacific Crest Trail (PCT), has 25 year-round camp sites and charges \$10/night. Under the Recreation Enhancement Act (REA) signed in December of 2004, 95 percent of the revenue generated in a campground that is operated and maintained by the Forest Service (such as Cibbets Flat Campground) is returned to the unit where it was generated. Of this 95 percent authorized by legislation, 80 percent is distributed into a fund used for O&M, eliminated deferred maintenance, visitor services, etc., and 15 percent is used to offset the cost for collection on the Forest. The Forest manages this funding along with the revenue generated by the Adventure Pass program where 80 percent of the pass fee is returned to the forest, with 15 percent going to project headquarters to offset the sale of passes and 5 percent going to the Washington Office or Regional Office, as is authorized by the REA legislation. The funding helps to operate and maintain recreational facilities and improve visitor services (CNF, 2007b).

A decrease in tourism and the recreational experience at Cibbets Flat Campground and in CNF along the PCT would potentially result in a negative change in revenue that could affect CNF's ability to fund repair, maintenance, and enhancement of facilities, visitor services, habitat restoration, law enforcement, and operating expenses within CNF. Implementation of Mitigation Measures WR-1a, WR-1b, and WR-1c, presented in Section E.2.5 (Wilderness and Recreation), would mitigate potential impacts that would potentially result in a substantial change to CNF revenues to a less than significant level.

It should be noted that use of the BCD South Option (see Section E.2.14.2 below) would eliminate recreation and any resulting revenue impacts to the PCT and Cibbets Flat Campground (MP BCD-14 to BCD-19.5).

Revenue from Agricultural Operations. Construction in agricultural areas of the BCD Alternative would require construction equipment to traverse agricultural land. This would temporarily restrict crop production or damage crops if activities occurred during the growing season. The restriction of crop production or damage to crops would decrease revenues for the agricultural landowners whose crops would be affected by project activities. As discussed in Section E.2.6 (Agricultural Resources), land under active agricultural operation would be temporarily impacted by construction activities, which could affect revenues (Class II). This would involve the construction and/or expansion of access roads, the installation of tower structures and wires, and the presence/staging of construction equipment and vehicles.

As part of the project, APMs and mitigation would be implemented to reduce the effects of construction on agricultural operations. APM LU-3 states that farmers (or other applicable parties) will be compensated for project-related losses of crops or other pertinent agricultural resources based upon a professional appraisal. Because impacts to Active Agricultural Operations would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of AG-1a and AG-1c, any associated impacts to revenues would be less than sig-

nificant. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are recommended outside of those presented in Section E.2.6 (Agricultural Resources) to mitigate potential impacts that would result in a substantial change to local agricultural 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 Imperial and San Diego Counties, 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).

Mitigation Measures for Impact S-1: Project construction would cause a substantial change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments

- WR-1a** Coordinate construction schedule and activities with the authorized officer for the recreation area.
- WR-1b** Provide temporary detours for trail users.
- WR-1c** Coordinate with local agencies to identify alternative recreation areas.
- AG-1a** Avoid interference with agricultural operations.
- AG-1c** Coordinate with grazing operators.

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

Construction of tower foundations would not be within any roadways, thereby avoiding any utilities in roads. 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, 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, because few existing utilities are located near the route. Compliance with California Government Code §§4216-4216.9 (see Anza-Borrego Link impact discussion in Section D.14.6 for more detail) and APMs PSU-APM-1 and PSU-APM-2 (which has similar requirements to California Government Code §§4216-4216.9) 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 BCD Alternative would traverse Active Agricultural Operations (grazing operations) between MP 0 and 8 and MP 10 and 12. On off-road agricultural lands there is the potential to accidentally disrupt underground irrigation pipes and/or drain tile systems during excavation or other ground disturbing construction activities (Class II). However, under Mitigation Measure AG-1a, SDG&E must 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 and/or tiling 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. An average of 27,000 gallons per day of water would be used for dust control and 36 gallons/yard³ of water would be used for tower construction (including water for concrete production). This quantity would be reduced with use of soil binders, as specified in Mitigation Measure AQ-1a in Section E.2.11 (Air Quality). Most of the area surrounding the alternative route is supplied by well water, and so water for construction would be obtained from San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), which provides up to 97 percent of the water used in the San Diego County region, and/or from Barrett Lake or Morena Reservoir, both of which are nearby to the alternative route and are owned by the City of San Diego. 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 BCD 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 landfills along the almost 20-mile alternative route would be the (CIWMB, 2007):

- Allied Imperial Landfill (104 East Robinson Road) that allows a maximum permitted throughput of 1,135 tons/day and has a remaining capacity of 2,105,500 cubic yards
- Imperial Solid Waste Site (1705 West Worthington Road) that allows a maximum permitted throughput of 207 tons/day and has a remaining capacity of 183,871 cubic yards
- Las Pulgas Landfill (Camp Pendleton) that allows a maximum permitted throughput of 270 tons/day and has a remaining capacity of 9,150,000 cubic yards
- Ramona Landfill (20630 Pamo Road) that allows a maximum of 295 tons/day and has a remaining capacity of 690,000 cubic yards
- 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).

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 BCD 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 (Section D.10, Public Health and Safety, discusses impacts in the event that contaminated soil is encountered). Therefore, construction waste generated by the Proposed Project 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.2.15 (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 BCD 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). Cibbets Flat Campground is approximately one mile away from the line so once operational, the line would not significantly impact the campground or associated revenues. 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.2.15 (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 proj-

ect would have a significant effect on local communities. Cost of fire suppression is also discussed in Section E.2.15 (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 and 3,000 gallons of water per day. Water would be trucked to the individual structures; however, compared to water usage during project construction and overall available supply of surrounding 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. The BLM and 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, BLM and 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 on federal land in San Diego County is \$43.81 per acre of ROW per year (CNF, 2007a). Linear ROW fees go direct to the U.S. Treasury's general fund.

This alternative would not result in an adverse change in public resource revenue. Furthermore, the BCD 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 BCD 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 BCD 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.2.3), 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.2.14.3 BCD South Option

The socioeconomics, public services, and utilities setting is similar to the BCD Alternative and the Interstate 8 Alternative in this area. Likewise, demographics, housing, and public services and utilities providers information would be the same as the Proposed Project in San Diego County, which is described in Section D.14.2. The line would not parallel or cross any existing transmission lines. Most of the area surrounding the alternative route is supplied by well water, and so this water for construction would be obtained from San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) and/or from Barrett Lake or Morena Reservoir, both of which are nearby to the alternative route and are owned by the City of San Diego. Likewise, the impacts would be the same as discussed in Section E.2.14.1 above (see Impacts S-1 through S-5).