

## C.13 Population and Housing

This section presents comprehensive baseline population, housing, and employment data applicable to the proposed Project. As identified in Section B, Description of the Proposed Project, the study area for the Project includes Los Angeles County, Kern County, and the Cities of Palmdale and Lancaster. Baseline population, housing, and employment information is presented in Sections C.13.1. Current demographic data is provided from the Year 2000 U.S. Census. Estimates of future population, housing, and employment are presented with the most recently approved and published Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and Kern County Council of Governments (COG) estimates for jurisdictions, subregional areas, and major statistical areas where available.

The growth inducing impacts of the proposed Project (the potential for the Project to induce substantial population growth in an area indirectly; for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure) is evaluated in Section E, Other CEQA Considerations.

### C.13.1 Environmental Setting

#### C.13.1.1 Demographic Characteristics

As indicated in Table C.13-1, the U.S. Census Year 2000 population of Los Angeles County was 9,519,338. During the period between 2000 and 2020, the population of Los Angeles County is estimated to increase by approximately ~~28~~ 21 percent, resulting in a 2020 population of approximately ~~12,249,200~~ 11,501,884. In comparison, the year 2000 population of the City of Lancaster was 118,718, which only accounts for 1.2 percent of the total Los Angeles County population. Year 2020 population projections for the City of Lancaster expect the population to increase to ~~149,584~~ 215,468, which is an increase of ~~26~~ 81 percent. The year 2000 population of the City of Palmdale was 116,670, which accounts for 1.2 percent of the total Los Angeles County population. Year 2020 population projections for the City of Palmdale expect the population to increase to ~~144,372~~ 259,712 residents, which is an increase of ~~24~~ 123 percent. The Year 2000 population for Kern County was 661,645. During the period between 2000 and 2020, the population of Kern County is estimated to increase by approximately ~~30~~ 44 percent, resulting in a 2020 population of approximately ~~857,492~~ 950,112 residents.

Location	2000 <sup>1</sup>	2010 <sup>2</sup>	2020 <sup>2</sup>	2000-2020 Change
Los Angeles County	9,519,338	<del>10,868,900</del> <u>10,718,007</u>	<del>12,249,200</del> <u>11,501,884</u>	<del>2,729,862</del> <u>21,982,546</u> ( <del>28</del> <u>21</u> %)
Kern County	661,645	<del>757,086</del> <u>808,808</u>	<del>857,492</del> <u>950,112</u>	<del>195,847</del> <u>288,467</u> ( <del>30</del> <u>44</u> %)
City of Lancaster	118,718	<del>132,574</del> <u>168,032</u>	<del>149,584</del> <u>215,468</u>	<del>30,866</del> <u>96,750</u> ( <del>26</del> <u>81</u> %)
City of Palmdale	116,670	<del>129,846</del> <u>176,506</u>	<del>144,372</del> <u>259,712</u>	<del>27,702</del> <u>143,042</u> ( <del>24</del> <u>123</u> %)

Sources: <sup>1</sup>U.S. Census, 2000; <sup>2</sup>SCAG, 2004, COG, 2004a.

### C.13.1.2 Housing Characteristics

As indicated in Table C.13-2, the 2000 U.S. Census showed that there were 3,270,909 housing units within Los Angeles County. Of the year 2000 total number of housing units within Los Angeles County, 4.2 percent were vacant. During the period between 2000 and 2020, the number of housing units within Los Angeles County is estimated to increase by approximately 30 percent, resulting in 4,252,181 housing units by the year 2020. In comparison, the City of Lancaster contained 41,745 housing units in 2000, which only accounts for 1.3 percent of the total Los Angeles County housing. Projections for the City of Lancaster expect the number of housing units to increase to 55,938 by the year 2020, which is an increase of 34 percent. The City of Palmdale contained 37,096 housing units in 2000, which accounts for 1.1 percent of the total Los Angeles County housing units. Year 2020 projections for the City of Palmdale expect the number of housing units to total 47,557, which is an increase of 28 percent. Year 2000 Census showed that there were 231,564 housing units within Kern County. Of the year 2000 total number of housing units within Kern County, 9.9 percent were vacant. During the period between 2000 and 2020, the number of housing units within Kern County is estimated to increase by approximately 31 percent, resulting in 304,275 housing units by the year 2020.

Location	2000	2010	2020	2000-2030 Change
Los Angeles County Vacancy Rate	3,270,909 137,135 (4.2%)	3,863,330	4,252,181	981,272 (30%)
Kern County Vacancy Rate	231,564 22,912 (9.9%)	267,510	304,275	72,711(31%)
City of Lancaster Vacancy Rate	41,745 3,521 (8.4%)	48,868	55,938	14,193 (34%)
City of Palmdale Vacancy Rate	37,096 2,811 (7.6%)	43,037	47,557	10,461(28%)

\*Totals include both occupied and unoccupied housing units  
 Sources: U.S. Census, 2000; SCAG, 2002; COG, 2004.

### C.13.1.3 Employment Characteristics

The majority of the labor force that would be involved in construction of the proposed Project is listed in the California Employment Development Department’s (EDD) labor force statistics as “Construction,” and many of the workers fall into the “Specialty Trade Construction” workforce under “Construction” (EDD, 2005). Table C.13-3 provides the total number of workers within the study area and local jurisdiction within the ROW for the year 2000, including those identified as employed within the “Construction” category.

As shown in Table C.13-3, of the total 4,312,264 workers within Los Angeles County, 202,829 (or 4.7 percent) worked in the construction trades in the year 2000. In comparison, the City of Lancaster contains 2,723 workers in the construction trades (or 5.5 percent of the total year 2000 workforce), while the City of Palmdale contains 5,261 workers in the construction trades (or 12.1 percent of the total year 2000 workforce). Within Kern County, 25,660 (or 11.1 percent) worked in the construction trades in the year 2000.

<b>Table C.13-3. Employment Characteristics*</b>	
<b>Location</b>	<b>2000</b>
Los Angeles County	4,312,264
Construction Trades	202,829 (4.7%)
Unemployment Rate	354,347(8.2%)
Kern County	267,603
Construction Trades	25,660 (11.1%)
Unemployment Rate	31,697 (6.7%)
City of Lancaster	49,136
Construction Trades	2,723 (5.5%)
Unemployment Rate	5,445 (11.1%)
City of Palmdale	48,286
Construction Trades	5,261 (12.1%)
Unemployment Rate	4,709 (6.1%)

\*includes both civilian and military employment

Sources: U.S. Census, 2000; SCAG, 2002; COG, 2004.

## **C.13.2 Regulatory Framework**

### **C.13.2.1 Local**

#### **Kern County**

The Land Use Element of the Kern County General Plan provides guidance and polices to regulate housing growth within the County (Kern County, 2004). The Kern County General Plan includes the following policy applicable to the proposed Project:

- Minimize land use conflicts between residential and resource, commercial, or industrial land uses.

#### **Kern County Council of Governments**

Government Code Section 65584 requires the Kern County Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to provide its determination of the region’s existing and projected housing needs to the Kern Council of Governments (COG). It is the COG’s responsibility to allocate housing to jurisdictions within its area of responsibility.

Adopted in May 2001, the HCD prepared the 2000 Regional Housing Allocation Plan (RHAP). Based upon the projected growth in the number of households in Kern County between 2000 and 2007, HCD calculated the number of additional units that need to be available during that period. For purposes of the RHAP, Kern County was divided into eight regional planning areas, with the proposed project site lying within Region 8, Antelope Valley Planning Area. The Antelope Valley Planning area occupies 1,381.5 square miles in the southeastern quarter of Kern County. The incorporated city of California City and the unincorporated communities of Boron, Mojave, North Edwards, Willow Springs, and Rosamond are situated within this planning area.

Table C.13-4 summarizes the results of the RHAP for both the Antelope Valley Planning Area and Kern County.

Income Level	Antelope Valley Planning Area	Kern County
Very Low	986	6,903
Low	728	5,102
Moderate to Above Moderate	2,570	18,007
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,284</b>	<b>30,012</b>

Source: COG, 2001.

### **Los Angeles County**

The Housing Element of the Los Angeles County General Plan provides background information regarding housing and general policy guidance, but does not contain any housing policies applicable to the proposed Project (Los Angeles County, 2001).

### **Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)**

SCAG is a Joint Powers Agency established under California Government Code §6502 et seq. SCAG is designated as a Council of Governments, a Regional Transportation Planning Agency, and a Metropolitan Planning Organization for the six-county region of Orange, Los Angeles, Ventura, San Bernardino, Riverside, and Imperial counties. The region encompasses a population exceeding 16.4 million persons in an area of more than 38,000 square miles.

SCAG prepares a Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the six-county regions of Ventura, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange, and Imperial counties and 193 local jurisdictions (187 cities and 6 counties). The RHNA defines the housing need allocation for each member local government in Southern California. The most recently published RHNA covered the planning period, January 1, 1998, through June 30, 2005.

The housing construction need is determined for four broad household income categories: very low (households making less than 50 percent of median family income), low (50-80 percent of median family income), moderate (80-120 percent of median family income), and above moderate (more than 120 percent of median family income). The intent of the future needs allocation by income groups is to relieve the undue concentration of very low and low income households in a single jurisdiction, and to help allocate resources in a fair and equitable manner.

The RHNA is a key tool for SCAG and its member governments to plan for this growth. Table C.13-5 displays the final Housing Need determinations adopted by SCAG in November 2000 for the Cities of Lancaster, Palmdale, and Unincorporated Los Angeles County.

### **City of Lancaster**

The Housing Element of the City of Lancaster General Plan provides background information regarding housing and general policy guidance, but does not contain any housing policies applicable to the proposed Project (Lancaster, 1997)

Income Level	Lancaster	Palmdale	Unincorporated Los Angeles County
Very Low	1,609	1,974	264
Low	1,241	1,521	192
Moderate	1,681	2,487	200
Above Moderate	2,675	3,895	554
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,205</b>	<b>9,878</b>	<b>1,209</b>

Source: SCAG, 2000.

### City of Palmdale

The Housing Element of the City of Palmdale General Plan provides background information regarding housing and general policy guidance, but does not contain any housing policies applicable to the proposed Project (Palmdale, 1993).

### C.13.3 Applicant-Proposed Measures (APMs)

SCE has no Applicant-Proposed Measures (APMs) to reduce population and housing impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project.

### C.13.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section explains how impacts are assessed including the presentation of the significance criteria in Section C.13.4.1 on which impact determinations are based, and Section C.13.4.2 lists all impacts identified for the proposed Project.

#### C.13.4.1 Criteria for Determining Significance

With respect to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3, Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Article 9(a), Section 15131, states the following in regards to Economic and Social Effects:

- (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.

For this analysis, the significance of population and housing impacts depends on whether the proposed Project would create population in excess of projected growth, require the removal of housing, or cause a substantial change in local employment requiring the need for more housing. Population and housing impacts would be considered significant if:

- Criterion POP-1: Directly induce substantial population growth in an area (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses).
- Criterion POP-2: Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or persons necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- Criterion POP-3: Cause substantial change in local employment.

Growth-inducing impacts of the proposed Project (the potential for the Project to induce substantial population growth in an area indirectly; for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure) are evaluated in Section E, Other CEQA Considerations.

### **C.13.4.2 Impact Analysis**

The following presents the expected population and housing impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project, and presents mitigation to reduce potential impacts.

#### **C.13.4.2.1 Impact and Mitigation Summary**

This section summarizes the conclusions of the impact analysis and associated mitigation measures presented in Section C.13.4.2.2. Table C.13-6 lists each impact identified for the proposed Project, along with the significance of each impact. Impacts are classified as Class I (significant, cannot be mitigated to a level that is less than significant), Class II (significant, can be mitigated to a level that is less than significant), Class III (adverse, but less than significant), or Class IV (beneficial). Detailed discussions of each impact and the specific locations where each is identified are presented in the following sections.

<b>Table C.13-6. Impact and Mitigation Summary – Population and Housing</b>		
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Impact Significance</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures*</b>
P-1: The proposed Project would require the removal of residential housing structures.	Class I (Proposed Project and Option B only; <del>Class II</del> Impact for Option A)	<del>L-3 (PP and Option B)</del> L-2

\* Applicable to significant impacts only (i.e., Class I and Class II).

#### **C.13.4.2.2 Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

##### ***Directly induce substantial population growth in an area (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses). (Criterion POP 1)***

The proposed Project would involve construction of new transmission line infrastructure between the Tehachapi Wind Resource Area, located in southern Kern County, California, and SCE’s existing Vincent Substation, located near Acton in unincorporated Los Angeles County, California (see Figure B.1-1). The proposed Project would connect through SCE’s existing Antelope Substation in the City of Lancaster, with

Segment 2 consisting of the portion of the proposed Project south of Antelope Substation and Segment 3 consisting of the portion of the Project north of Antelope Substation. The proposed Project does not include the construction of any habitable housing structures and would not construct any businesses. As described in Section B.4, Facility Operation and Maintenance, both Substation Two and Substation One would be unmanned. There would be no change in manning for the existing Antelope Substation or Vincent Substation. All telecommunications equipment would be operated and maintained by SCE technicians. Therefore, no direct population growth would occur as a result of the proposed Project. No impacts would occur.

#### **Option A**

Option A would not include the construction of any habitable housing structures and would not construct any businesses. Therefore, no direct population growth would occur as a result of Option A. No impacts would occur.

#### **Option B**

Option B would not include the construction of any habitable housing structures and would not construct any businesses. Therefore, no direct population growth would occur as a result of Option B. No impacts would occur.

#### ***Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or persons necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. (Criterion POP 2)***

The proposed Project would traverse city and unincorporated county jurisdictions including Kern County, Los Angeles County, City of Lancaster, and the City of Palmdale. Within the proposed 56.8-mile transmission line corridor, there are residential areas that would be impacted by the proposed Project.

#### ***Impact P-1: The proposed Project would require the removal of residential housing structures (Class I)***

As described in Section C.8, Land Use, Table C.8-1, more than 80 residences are located less than 0.2 miles (approximately 1,000 feet) from the Project. The following single-family residences are located along the proposed Project ROW (refer to Section C.8, Land Use, Table C.8-1 for the locations of all residences relative to the Project):

- **Segment 3.** Single-family residences located along 110<sup>th</sup> Street West and Avenue A in unincorporated Kern County; along 110<sup>th</sup> Street West, 105<sup>th</sup> Street West, 100<sup>th</sup> Street West, Avenue D, Avenue E-11, and Avenue J in unincorporated Los Angeles County; and along Avenue J in the City of Lancaster.
- **Segment 2.** Single-family residences are located along 90<sup>th</sup> Street West, Godde Hill Road, Hacienda Ranch Road, Cherry Tree Lane, Elizabeth Lake Road, Tuckerway Ranch Road, Peaceful Valley Road, Rockyford Road, Kentucky Springs Road, and Hillside Drive in unincorporated Los Angeles County; along Avenue K-8, Avenue L, Avenue L-8, and 85<sup>th</sup> Street in the City of Lancaster; and along 75<sup>th</sup> Street West, 70<sup>th</sup> Street West, the Ritter Ranch development, and the Anaverde Ranch development in the City of Palmdale.

**Impact P-1: The proposed Project would require the removal of residential housing structures (Class I)**

The Project would require the removal of existing and planned (approved) residential structures within the proposed Project ROW along Segment 2. The following represents areas of proposed and existing residential housing that would be removed as a result of the proposed Project:

- ~~Single Family Residential structure located on Avenue L (traversed by ROW at Mile S2-2.1), City of Lancaster~~
- Single-Family Residential structures located on Cherry Tree Lane (traversed by ROW at Mile S2-7.4, and Option B), Unincorporated Los Angeles County
- Planned residential units within Ritter Ranch (traversed by Option B), City of Palmdale
- Planned residential units within Anaverde Ranch development (traversed by Option B), City of Palmdale
- ~~Residential units within Palmdale 1000 Development (traversed by Mile S2-16.3 to Mile S2-16.8), Unincorporated Los Angeles County~~

~~The proposed Project would traverse an existing residence in the City of Lancaster along Avenue L (Mile S2-2.2) that is located within an olive orchard. Construction and operation of the proposed Project would require the displacement and relocation of this residence. However, the displacement of this residence could be reduced to a less than significant level with a re-route around this residence. Therefore, Mitigation Measure L-2 (Re-locate Project ROW to Avoid Residence), as identified in Section C.8, Land Use, would be recommended to avoid permanent impacts to this residence in the City of Lancaster. The removal of this existing residence would result in a less than significant impact with implementation of mitigation (Class II).~~

The proposed easement alignment would also traverse three existing residences in unincorporated Los Angeles County along Cherry Tree Lane (Mile S2-7.4), and would require the displacement and relocation of these three residences for construction and operation of the proposed Project. The removal of these housing units as a result of the proposed Project is considered a significant impact (**Class I**). This impact can only be avoided with a re-route around the residences along Cherry Tree Lane, such as the routes presented in Option A (see discussion below) and in Alternative 4 (See Section D for discussion of alternatives). If Option A or Alternative 4 were selected, impacts to existing residences in unincorporated Los Angeles County would not occur.

While the removal of these housing units in unincorporated Los Angeles County along Cherry Tree Lane (Mile S2-7.4) is considered a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed Project, the removal of this housing is not expected to adversely impact the total housing needs for the area, as identified above in Table 4.13-5, Southern California Association of Governments Regional Housing Needs Assessment Years 1998 to 2005. The removal of these residential structures within the proposed Project ROW would require a minimum of three existing residences in unincorporated Los Angeles County along Cherry Tree Lane (Mile S2-7.4). As shown in Table 4.13-5, the most recently published RHNA for the City of Lancaster, City of Palmdale, and Unincorporated Los Angeles County requires a total of 18,292 housing units to be constructed over a seven-year period. The number of residential structures removed as a result of the proposed Project would likely constitute a non-significant number of this required new housing for the area as designated by SCAG, and would not require an increase to the amount of planned residential in the area. Therefore, the Project is

considered consistent with the SCAG RHNA. The proposed Project would not alter existing or future housing in Kern County, and would be consistent with the COG RHAP.

### ***Mitigation Measures for Impact P-1***

Mitigation Measure L-3 (Coordinate with Ritter Ranch and Anaverde Ranch) as identified in Section C.8, Land Use, would be recommended to avoid impacts to proposed school sites, as well as other infrastructure including future homes. Mitigation Measure L-2 (Re-locate Project ROW to Avoid Residence), as identified in Section C.8, Land Use, would be recommended to avoid permanent impacts to an existing residence in the City of Lancaster along Avenue L (Mile S2-2.2) that is located within an olive orchard. However, residences would continue to be removed along Cherry Tree Lane, and can only be avoided with a re-route around these residences, such as the routes presented in Option A and in Alternative 4. As such, overall Project impacts would remain significant and unavoidable (Class I).

### **Option A**

Option A is identical to the proposed Project except between Mile S2-5.7 and Mile S2-7.7, where the alignment deviates from the proposed ROW to avoid three existing homes located north of Elizabeth Lake Road. As such, no existing or approved housing structures would be removed for Option A. Option A would continue to require the removal of an existing residence along Avenue L in the City of Lancaster. However, impacts to this single family residence would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure L-2 (Re-locate Project ROW to Avoid Residence) (Class II). With Mitigation Measure L-2, Option A would avoid permanent impacts to residences.

### **Option B**

Option B deviates from the proposed Project at Mile S2-8.1 by continuing in a southeasterly direction parallel to the existing Antelope-Vincent corridor through the Ritter Ranch and Anaverde Ranch community development areas, rejoining the proposed Project route at Mile S2-11.2 (proposed Project Mile S2-14.9). The remainder of the route would be identical to the proposed Project route. Option B would be sited across the under construction residential communities of Ritter Ranch ~~and the planned Anaverde Ranch development area, in areas that have been graded for housing development.~~ Existing Planned residences would be located east of ~~and immediately adjacent to the Option B route within these Ritter Ranch areas and Anaverde Ranch.~~ Should final engineering of Option B require that towers be sited within these planned ~~and under construction residential communities where constructed and planned~~ residential homes would be located within the ROW, Option B would increase the amount of relocated residential homes as compared to the proposed Project. Within Ritter Ranch, Option B has the potential to result in the removal of 117 single-family home sites and 89 detached condominium sites, as well as requiring the relocation of the Ritter Ranch Substation and corresponding 66-kV subtransmission lines. Within Anaverde Ranch, Option B has the potential to result in the removal of several dozen (or more) homes, affecting a school site, and recreational open space. In addition, Option B would continue to require the removal of residential units identical to those listed above for the proposed Project along Cherry Tree Lane. Mitigation Measure L-3 (Coordinate with Ritter Ranch and Anaverde Ranch) has been recommended to avoid impacts to proposed school sites, as well as other infrastructure including future homes. Mitigation Measure L-2 (Re-locate Project ROW to Avoid Residence) has been proposed to avoid the relocation of a residence along Avenue L in the City of Lancaster. However, the removal of residences along Cherry Tree Lane and the siting of Option B across ~~under construction and planned~~ residential communities would create significant and unavoidable impacts (Class I).

### **Cause substantial change in local employment. (Criterion POP 3)**

Construction employment for the proposed Project would include skilled or semi-skilled positions including line workers, welders, heavy equipment operators, surveyors, engineers, utility equipment workers, truck drivers, warehouse workers, clerical workers, and laborers. As indicated in Table C.13-3, Employment Characteristics, Los Angeles County and Kern County both contain a large construction workforce. As indicated in Section B, Description of the proposed Project, Section B.3 Project Construction, the combined construction workforce for all proposed project components is anticipated to range from approximately 50 to 300, with an estimated average daily workforce of 130 personnel. The maximum required construction workforce of 300 personnel required for the proposed Project would comprise 0.13 percent of the total Los Angeles County and Kern County construction workforce. Because such a large construction workforce is available within the area, and the proposed workforce would comprise such a minimal amount of the available workforce within the area, it is unlikely any construction workers would be relocated from outside the area as a result of the proposed Project due to the relative brevity of the construction period. Furthermore, as discussed in Section E.3.1, any construction workers traveling to the Project route would likely stay in temporary and short-term housing (hotels). Therefore, no workers are expected to relocate to the area permanently for construction and no new workers are required for operation of the project. The Project would not result in any impacts to the existing local employment conditions.

#### **Option A**

Option A is identical to the proposed Project except between Mile S2-5.7 and Mile S2-7.7, where the alignment deviates from the proposed ROW to avoid three existing homes located north of Elizabeth Lake Road. It is assumed that construction of Option A would be similar or identical to the proposed Project. Therefore, a similar construction workforce would be required and would occur within the same geographic area. As described above for the proposed Project, no workers are expected to relocate to the area permanently for construction and no new workers are required for operation of Option A. No impacts to the existing local employment conditions would occur as a result of Option A.

#### **Option B**

While Option B would decrease the length of the route by approximately 3.7 miles, a similar construction workforce would be required and would occur within the same geographic area as that associated with the proposed Project. As described above for the proposed Project, no workers are expected to relocate to the area permanently for construction and no new workers are required for operation of Option B. No impacts to the existing local employment conditions would occur as a result of Option B.