D.14 Socioeconomics

Section D.14.1 gives a brief overview of the regional setting and approach to data collection used in this analysis. Sections D.14.2 and D.14.3 present comprehensive baseline population, housing, and employment data, as well as information on utilities and public services along the Proposed Project route. Section D.14.4 provides the applicable socioeconomic regulations, plans, and standards associated with the project. Section D.14.5 provides the impact significance criteria and approach to impact assessment, while Sections D.14.6 and D.14.7 provide discussions of the environmental impacts and mitigation measures for the Proposed Project. Sections D.14.8 and D.14.9 provide discussions of the environmental impacts and mitigation measures for the alternatives to the Proposed Project.

D.14.1 Regional Setting and Approach to Data Collection

As illustrated in Section B.2.1, Overview of the Proposed Project, the study area for the project includes the cities and counties located along the ROW, including San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, California, and La Paz and Maricopa Counties, Arizona. In addition to incorporated and unincorporated county and city land, the ROW also traverses Bureau of Land Management (BLM) land in both Arizona and California and Indian reservation lands within the State of California. Because of the scale of the Proposed Project, the majority of which traverses undeveloped land in unincorporated portions of Riverside, La Paz, and Maricopa Counties, socioeconomic data was collected for counties, cities, and communities that would be traversed by the project or would be within two miles of the project. These jurisdictions in the vicinity of the Proposed Project that could potentially be affected by the socioeconomic impacts of the project comprise the study area analyzed in this section. Regional and local socioeconomic information is presented in Sections D.14.2.1 through D.14.3.5. Current demographic data are provided from the Year 2000 U.S. Census, and public services and utility information was collected from planning documents or other published information from the jurisdictions in the study area.

D.14.2 Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project – Devers-Harquahala

This section of the Proposed Project would include the construction of a 500 kV transmission line and related facilities between the Harquahala Generating Station switchyard, located near the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station (PVNGS) west of Phoenix, Arizona, to SCE's Devers Substation (Devers), located near Palm Springs, California. The Proposed Project ROW along this segment travels primarily through natural resource areas and rural lands scattered with occasional agricultural areas. Because this segment of the Proposed Project does not travel directly through heavily populated areas, county data is presented and analyzed for this segment. Socioeconomic resources affected during Proposed Project construction (i.e., construction workers, available housing, public services, and utilities) would likely come from within the entire county, as well as nearby cities or neighboring counties.

D.14.2.1 Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge

The Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) segment extends approximately 53 miles across land under the jurisdiction of the BLM and the Arizona State Land Department, and portions of unincorporated Maricopa and La Paz Counties in Arizona. While this segment of the Proposed Project is partially located within Maricopa County, which has a large overall population due to the presence of

the City of Phoenix within the county, the project corridor is located within a rural area in the western portion of the county. Leaving Harquahala, the proposed route would traverse 4.8 miles of agricultural land prior to turning north and joining the existing DPV1 ROW. The proposed route would then travel north of I-10, paralleling the Central Arizona Project (CAP) Canal for approximately 20 miles before turning and crossing I-10 as the route progresses southwest. The City of Buckeye, located in Maricopa County, approximately 17 miles east of the proposed route, is the nearest incorporated city within this segment. Table D.14-1 identifies the year 2000 Census population, housing, and employment statistics for the jurisdictions that would be potentially affected by this segment of the project route.

Table D.14-2 provides public service and utility data for cities and counties along the Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment.

Table D.14-1. Demographic Characteristics – Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge Segment

Location	2000 Population	2000 Housing	2000 Employment
Maricopa County (AZ)	3,072,149	1,250,231 Vacancy Rate 9.4% (117,345 units)	1,427,292 10.5% in Construction Trades (149,539)
La Paz County (AZ)	19,715	15,133 Vacancy Rate 44.7% (6,771 units)[1]	6,567 11.1% in Construction Trades (726)
City of Buckeye (Maricopa Co, AZ)	6,537	2,344 Vacancy Rate 7.9% (186 units)	2,474 19.2% in Construction Trades (474)

1 Note: 5,237 Seasonal Housing Units Included
Source: U.S. Census 2000 Lookup, http://factfinder.census.gov accessed February 2, 2006.

Table D.14-2. Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction – Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge Segment

Maricopa County	
Natural gas & electricity – Arizona Public Service Company, Southwest Gas Corporation Water – Central Arizona Water Conservation District Wastewater – Maricopa County Environmental Services Department Water & Waste Management Division Telecommunications – Qwest, Cox	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Lone Cactus Landfill – Waste Management, 7th Avenue Landfill – Waste Management, El Mirage Inert Landfill, Weinberger Landfill, Calmat Litchfield Landfill, M.R. Tanner Landfill. Fire protection – Maricopa County Fire Department Police protection – Maricopa County Sheriff's Office Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
La Paz County	
Natural gas & electricity – Arizona Public Service Company, Southwest Gas Corporation Water – Central Arizona Water Conservation District Wastewater – La Paz County Public Works Department Solid Waste (Landfills) – La Paz County Landfill. Telecommunications – Verizon, TDS	Fire protection – La Paz County Fire Department Police protection – La Paz County Sheriff's Office Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
City of Buckeye (Maricopa County)	
Natural gas & electricity – Arizona Public Service Company, Southwest Gas Corporation Water – Town of Buckeye Public Works Department Wastewater – Town of Buckeye Public Works Department Solid Waste (Landfills) – SR 85 Landfill Telecommunications – Qwest, Cox	Fire protection – Town of Buckeye Fire Department Police protection – Town of Buckeye Police Department Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None

Sources: Maricopa County – http://www.maricopa.gov
La Paz County – http://www.co.la-paz.az.us
Town of Buckeye – http://www.buckeyeaz.gov

The majority of the ROW for the DPV2 500 kV transmission line would be located adjacent to the existing DPV1 500 kV transmission line. Within this segment, the following utility lines were identified to run parallel to or cross the ROW:[1]

- Power distribution lines near Harquahala Station
- Central Arizona Project canal
- El Paso Natural Gas pipeline
- AT&T coaxial cable and underground lines
- Other aboveground and underground telecommunications lines.

D.14.2.2 Kofa National Wildlife Refuge

The Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment extends approximately 24 miles across the Kofa NWR, which is under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) within La Paz County, Arizona. The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing SCE ROW that traverses the Kofa NWR and is located adjacent to the New Water Mountains and Kofa wilderness areas. Because this segment of the project route is located within Kofa NWR and adjacent to federally designated wilderness areas, no homes or population are located within the refuge. Table D.14-1 identifies the year 2000 Census population, housing, and employment statistics within La Paz County, in which the Kofa NWR is located. Table D.14-2 provides public service and utility data for La Paz County. Within this segment, the Proposed Project would be parallel to or cross the existing DPV1 transmission line and the El Paso Natural Gas pipeline.

D.14.2.3 Kofa National Wildlife Refuge to Colorado River

The Kofa National Wildlife Refuge to Colorado River segment extends approximately 25 miles across land under the jurisdiction of the BLM and the Arizona State Land Department. Approximately 0.1 miles of the proposed route would traverse the northeast corner of the Department of Defense Yuma Proving Ground. The nearest community is the Town of Quartzsite, located approximately five miles north of the Proposed Project route along Highway 95. The Colorado River Indian Reservation is immediately adjacent on the northern side of the ROW for a portion of the Proposed Project route. The entire Kofa National Wildlife Refuge to Colorado River segment is located within La Paz County, Arizona. Tables D.14-1 and D.14-2, above, present population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities data for La Paz County. Table D.14-3 identifies the year 2000 Census population, housing, and employment statistics for other jurisdictions within this segment of the project route. The La Posa Long Term Visitor Area outside of the Town of Quartzsite includes 11,400 acres of primitive campgrounds, recreational vehicle

Table D.14-3. Demographic Characteristics – Kofa National Wildlife Refuge to Colorado River Segment

Location	2000 Population	2000 Housing	2000 Employment
Town of Quartzsite (La Paz Co, AZ)	3,354	3,186 Vacancy Rate 41.9% (1,336 units)[1]	608 11.0% in Construction Trades (67)
Colorado River Indian Reservation (La Paz Co, AZ)	9,201	5,894 Vacancy Rate 44.5% (2,623 units)[2]	3,413 8.9% in Construction Trades (304)

1 Note: 1,058 Seasonal Housing Units Included
2 Note: 1,980 Seasonal Housing Units Included
Source: U.S. Census 2000 Lookup, http://factfinder.census.gov accessed February 2, 2006.

[1] Utility lines in the vicinity of the ROW were identified by SCE in its data deficiency responses and during field reconnaissance performed by Aspen Environmental Group on June 13-15, 2005.

(RV) campsites, and other facilities. Section D.5, Wilderness and Recreation, provides a detailed description of the seasonal camping and recreational amenities around the Town of Quartzsite and describes changes in seasonal population due to recreation in the area.

Table D.14-4 provides the public service and utility providers for the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge to Colorado River segment of the Proposed Project.

Table D.14-4. Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction – Kofa National Wildlife Refuge to Colorado River Segment

Town of Quartzsite (La Paz County)	
Natural gas & electricity – Arizona Public Service Company, Southwest Gas Corporation Water – Individual Wells/Town of Quartzsite Public Works Dept. Wastewater – Individual Septic Tanks/Town of Quartzsite Public Works Dept. Telecommunications – Verizon, TDS	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Allied Waste Fire protection – Quartzsite Fire Department Police protection – Quartzsite Police Department Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
Colorado River Indian Reservation (La Paz County)	
Natural gas & electricity – Arizona Public Service Company, Southwest Gas Corporation Water – CRIT Regional Water System Wastewater – Colorado River Indian Tribes Telecommunications – Verizon, TDS	Solid Waste (Landfills) – La Paz County Landfill Fire protection – Tribal Volunteers Police protection – Tribal Police Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None

Sources: Town of Quartzsite http://www.ci.quartzsite.az.us
Colorado River Indian Reservation Community Profile, http://www.commerce.state.az.us/pdf/commasst/comm/colorver.pdf

The DPV2 500 kV transmission line would be located adjacent to the existing DPV1 500 kV transmission line in the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge to Colorado River segment, although in an approximately three-mile portion through the Copper Bottom Pass the conductors are already installed on existing double-circuit 500 kV towers. Within this segment, the Proposed Project would run parallel to or cross power distribution lines near Highway 95 and the El Paso Natural Gas pipeline.

D.14.2.4 Palo Verde Valley (Colorado River to Midpoint Substation)

The Palo Verde Valley segment is located in California and extends approximately 12 miles across unincorporated Riverside County and BLM land. This segment of the Proposed Project would travel south of I-10, and would be located approximately two miles south of the City of Blythe. The Proposed Project route would traverse approximately 11 miles of agricultural land in this segment. Table D.14-5 identifies the year 2000 Census population, housing, and employment statistics within this segment of the project route.

Table D.14-5. Demographic Characteristics – Palo Verde Valley (Colorado River to Midpoint Substation) Segment

Location	2000 Population	2000 Housing	2000 Employment
Riverside County (CA)	1,545,387	584,674 Vacancy Rate 13.4% (78,456 units)	602,856 11.8% in Construction Trades (70,974)
City of Blythe (Riverside Co, CA)	12,155	788 Vacancy Rate 16.1% (1,336 units)	4,540 9.7% in Construction Trades (439)

Source: U.S. Census 2000 Lookup, http://factfinder.census.gov accessed February 2, 2006.

Table D.14-6 provides the public service and utility providers for the Palo Verde Valley segment of the Proposed Project.

Table D.14-6. Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction – Palo Verde Valley (Colorado River to Midpoint Substation) Segment

Riverside County	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southwest Gas Corporation Water – Eastern Municipal Water District Wastewater – Eastern Municipal Water District Telecommunications – Verizon, SBC	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Riverside County Waste Management Department Fire protection – Riverside County Fire Department Police protection – Riverside County Sheriff's Department Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
City of Blythe (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southwest Gas Corporation Water – East Blythe County Water District Wastewater – Blythe Regional Wastewater Authority Telecommunications – Verizon, SBC	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Blythe Sanitary Landfill Fire protection – Blythe Fire Department, Riverside County Fire Department Police protection – Blythe Police Department, Riverside County Sheriff's Department Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None

Source: Eastern Municipal Water District, http://www.emwd.org
Riverside County Sheriff's Department, http://www.riversidesheriff.org
Riverside County Fire Department, http://www.rvcfire.org/opencms/opencms/index.html
City of Blythe, http://www.cityofblythe.com

The Proposed Project would continue to parallel the DPV1 500 kV transmission line in this segment, and would also run parallel to or cross the following utilities:[2]

- Power distribution lines at Lovekin Boulevard, Buck Boulevard, and Rannells Boulevard, as well as parallel to the ROW
- Two 161 kV power lines as the project approaches Midpoint Substation
- PG&E North Baja Natural Gas pipeline
- Palo Verde Irrigation District drains and levees
- D-10-11 canal.

D.14.2.5 Midpoint Substation

Midpoint Substation would be located at milepost E113.7, approximately five miles southwest of the City of Blythe. As the Midpoint Substation is located at the western end of the Palo Verde Valley (Colorado River to Midpoint Substation) segment described above in Section D.14.2.4, setting information for the Midpoint Substation segment would be the same as for the Palo Verde Valley. Table D.14-5 identifies the year 2000 Census population, housing, and employment statistics within Riverside County and the City of Blythe. Table D.14-6 provides public service and utility data for Riverside County and the City of Blythe.

D.14.2.6 Midpoint to Cactus City Rest Area

The Midpoint Substation to Cactus City Rest Area segment extends approximately 75 miles across land under the jurisdiction of the BLM and the California State Lands Commission, and portions of unincorporated Riverside County. Within this segment, the proposed route would travel south of I-10 for approximately 73 miles, and would cross to the north of I-10 at MP E185.6. The nearest community to this segment of the proposed route is unincorporated Desert Center, located approximately 0.8 miles north of the project route. This entire segment is located within unincorporated Riverside County, California.

[2] Utility lines in the vicinity of the ROW were identified by SCE in its data deficiency responses and during field reconnaissance performed by Aspen Environmental Group on June 13-15, 2005.

Tables D.14-5 and D.14-6, above, describe the population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities characteristics in Riverside County and the City of Blythe. Table D.14-7 identifies the year 2000 Census population, housing, and employment statistics for Desert Center.

Table D.14-8 lists the public service and utility providers for the Desert Center community.

Table D.14-7. Demographic Characteristics – Midpoint Substation to Cactus City Rest Area Segment

Location	2000 Population	2000 Housing	2000 Employment
Desert Center (Riverside Co, CA)	792	406 Vacancy Rate 31.3% (127 units)[1]	260 7.3% in Construction Trades (19)

1 Note: 99 Seasonal Housing Units Included
Source: U.S. Census 2000 Lookup, http://factfinder.census.gov accessed February 2, 2006.

Table D.14-8. Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction – Midpoint Substation to Cactus City Rest Area Segment

Desert Center (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Desert Center Sanitary Landfill
Water – Eastern Municipal Water District	Fire protection – Riverside County Fire Department
Wastewater – Eastern Municipal Water District	Police protection – Riverside County Sheriff's Department
Telecommunications – Verizon, SBC	Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None

Source: Eastern Municipal Water District, http://www.emwd.org
Riverside County Sheriff's Department, http://www.riversidesheriff.org
Riverside County Fire Department, http://www.rvcfire.org/opencms/opencms/index.html
Desert Center Profile, http://www.hometownlocator.com/City/Desert-Center-California.cfm

The Proposed Project would continue to parallel the DPV1 500 kV transmission line in this segment, and would also run parallel to or cross the following utilities:[3]

- One 166 kV power line parallel to I-10
- Power distribution lines at Wiley's Well Road
- Power distribution lines at Alligator Rock
- Natural gas pipeline at Alligator Rock
- Devers–Julian Hinds 220 kV Line
- AT&T underground coaxial cable
- Pacific Telephone & Telegraph underground coaxial cable
- Southern California Gas Company gas pipelines
- Water pipelines.

D.14.2.7 Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation

The Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation segment extends approximately 40 miles across land under the jurisdiction of the BLM, Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, unincorporated Riverside County, and the Cities of Coachella and Cathedral City. Within this segment, the proposed route would travel north of I-10 and north of the Cities of Indio, Palm Desert, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Springs. Wilderness areas and areas of critical environmental concern (ACECs) are located to the north and south of

[3] Utility lines in the vicinity of the ROW were identified by SCE in its data deficiency responses and during field reconnaissance performed by Aspen Environmental Group on June 13-15, 2005.

the Proposed Project, and Joshua Tree National Park is located north-northeast of this segment. Residential development continues to grow in this region, specifically in the communities north of the Cities of Indio and Rancho Mirage. The entire segment is located within Riverside County, California. Tables D.14-5 and D.14-6, above, describe the population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities characteristics in Riverside County. Table D.14-9 identifies the year 2000 Census population, housing, and employment statistics for the jurisdictions that would potentially be affected by the project.

Table D.14-10 provides the public service and utility providers for the Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation segment of the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project would continue to parallel the DPV1 500 kV transmission line in the Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation segment, and would also run parallel to or cross the following utilities:[4]

- Two 220 kV power lines as the project approaches Mirage Substation
- One 115 kV power line leaving Mirage Substation
- Devers–Julian Hinds 220 kV Line
- Southern California Gas Company gas pipelines.

Table D.14-9. Demographic Characteristics – Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation Segment

Location	2000 Population	2000 Housing	2000 Employment
City of Cathedral City (Riverside Co, CA)	42,647	17,893 Vacancy Rate 21.6% (3,866 units)	17,300 13.1% in Construction Trades (2,264)
City of Coachella (Riverside Co, CA)	22,724	5,024 Vacancy Rate 4.3% (217 units)	7,412 13.6% in Construction Trades (1,010)
City of Indio (Riverside Co, CA)	49,116	16,909 Vacancy Rate 18.0% (3,038 units)	17,801 15.5% in Construction Trades (2,760)
City of Palm Desert (Riverside Co, CA)	41,155	28,021 Vacancy Rate 31.5% (8,837 units)[1]	17,384 7.3% in Construction Trades (1,275)
City of Palm Springs (Riverside Co, CA)	42,807	30,823 Vacancy Rate 33.4% (10,307 units)[2]	17,841 8.0% in Construction Trades (1,432)
City of Rancho Mirage (Riverside Co, CA)	13,249	11,816 Vacancy Rate 42.3% (5,003 units)[3]	4,318 7.2% in Construction Trades (312)
Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indian Reservation (Riverside Co, CA)	154	56 Vacancy Rate 14.3% (8 units)	56 14.3% in Construction Trades (8)

1 Note: 6,445 Seasonal Housing Units Included
2 Note: 7,240 Seasonal Housing Units Included
3 Note: 3,079 Seasonal Housing Units Included
Source: U.S. Census 2000 Lookup, http://factfinder.census.gov accessed February 2, 2006.

[4] Utility lines in the vicinity of the ROW were identified by SCE in its data deficiency responses and during field reconnaissance performed by Aspen Environmental Group on June 13-15, 2005.

Table D.14-10. Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction – Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation Segment

City of Cathedral City (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Anza Landfill, Edom Hill Landfill
Water – Desert Water Agency, Coachella Valley Water District	Fire protection – Cathedral City Fire Department
Wastewater – Desert Water Agency, Coachella Valley Water District	Police protection – Cathedral City Police Department
Telecommunications – Verizon	Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
City of Coachella (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Coachella Sanitary Landfill
Water – Coachella Valley Water District	Fire protection – Coachella Fire Department
Wastewater – Coachella Valley Water District	Police protection – Coachella Police Department
Telecommunications – Verizon, Time Warner	Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
City of Indio (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Eagle Mountain Landfill
Water – Indio Water Authority	Fire protection – Indio Fire Department
Wastewater – Indio Water Authority	Police protection – Indio Police Department
Telecommunications – Verizon	Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
City of Palm Desert (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Eagle Mountain Landfill
Water – Coachella Valley Water District	Fire protection – Palm Desert Fire Department
Wastewater – Coachella Valley Water District	Police protection – Palm Desert Police Department
Telecommunications – Verizon	Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
City of Palm Springs (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Eagle Mountain Landfill, Palm Springs
Water – Desert Water Agency	Municipal Landfill
Wastewater – Palm Springs Wastewater Treatment Authority –	Fire protection – Palm Springs Fire Department
Veolia Water (Public/Private Partnership)	Police protection – Palm Springs Fire Department
Telecommunications – Verizon	Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
City of Rancho Mirage (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Anza Landfill, Eagle Mountain Landfill
Water – Coachella Valley Water District	Fire protection – Riverside County Fire Department
Wastewater – Coachella Valley Water District	Police protection – Riverside County Sheriff's Department
Telecommunications – Verizon, SBC	Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indian Reservation (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas	Solid Waste (Landfills) – N/A
Water – N/A	Fire protection – N/A
Wastewater – N/A	Police protection – N/A
Telecommunications – N/A	Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None

Sources: Cathedral City, http://www.cathedralcity.gov/Main/city_info.htm
City of Coachella, http://www.coachella.org
City of Indio, www.indio.org
City of Palm Desert, http://www.palm-desert.org
City of Palm Springs, http://www.ci.palm-springs.ca.us
City of Rancho Mirage, http://www.ci.rancho-mirage.ca.us
N/A – Information Not Publicly Available

D.14.3 Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project – West of Devers

While portions of the Proposed Project ROW in this segment would traverse unincorporated county lands, much of the Proposed Project in this segment would skirt developed or developing areas within the municipal boundaries of cities in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. Both county and city data are presented and analyzed as the socioeconomic resources provided during Proposed Project construction (i.e., construction workers, available housing, public services, and utilities) would come from within the counties, as well as the cities traversed by or near the project.

D.14.3.1 Devers Substation to East Border of Banning

The Devers Substation to East Border of Banning segment extends approximately 14 miles across land under the jurisdiction of the BLM, the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and portions of unincorporated Riverside County. Within this segment, the proposed route would travel north of I-10, north of the City of Palm Springs, and south of the City of Desert Hot Springs. Wilderness areas and ACECs are located to the north and south of the project, while the San Bernardino National Forest and the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument are located south of the Proposed Project. The Devers Substation to East Border of Banning segment is characterized by open space with concentrations of residential, commercial, and industrial development. In general, Riverside County has experienced a surge in development in order to keep pace with increasing population growth. Within the Devers Substation to East Border of Banning segment, residential development is primarily located in unincorporated Riverside County and would be adjacent to the proposed route in some areas. Commercial development along this segment is located in unincorporated Riverside County and on the Morongo Indian Reservation, and would be south of the project. The entire segment is located within Riverside County, California, and part of the segment travels north of the City of Palm Springs. Tables D.14-5 and D.14-6 above describe the population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities characteristics in Riverside County. Tables D.14-9 and D.14-10 above describe the population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities characteristics for the City of Palm Springs. Table D.14-11 identifies the year 2000 Census population, housing, and employment statistics for the other jurisdictions potentially affected by this segment of the project route.

Table D.14-11. Demographic Characteristics – Devers Substation to East Border of Banning Segment

Location	2000 Population	2000 Housing	2000 Employment
City of Desert Hot Springs (Riverside Co, CA)	16,582	7,034 Vacancy Rate 16.7% (1,175 units)	5,897 15.4% in Construction Trades (906)
Morongo Band of Mission Indian Reservation (Riverside Co, CA)	954	345 Vacancy Rate 13.3% (46 units)	207 12.1% in Construction Trades (25)

1 Note: 7,240 Seasonal Housing Units Included
Source: U.S. Census 2000 Lookup, http://factfinder.census.gov accessed February 2, 2006.

Table D.14-12 provides the public service and utility providers for the Devers Substation to East Border of Banning segment of the Proposed Project.

Table D.14-12. Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction – Devers Substation to East Border of Banning Segment

City of Desert Hot Springs (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Desert Center Landfill
Water – Colorado River Supply Regional Water Quality Control Board	Fire protection – City of Desert Hot Springs Fire Department
Wastewater – Alan Horton Wastewater Treatment Plant, and Wastewater Collection and Disposal Systems	Police protection – City of Desert Hot Springs Police Department
Telecommunications – Verizon	Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
Morongo Band of Mission Indian Reservation (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas	Solid Waste (Landfills) – N/A
Water – N/A	Fire protection – Morongo Indian Reservation Volunteers
Wastewater – N/A	Police protection – Morongo Indian Reservation Police Department
Telecommunications – N/A	Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None

Sources: City of Desert Hot Springs, http://www.desert-hot-springs.us
Morongo Indian Nation, http://www.morongonation.org
N/A – Information Not Publicly Available

The Proposed Project would follow the existing 220 kV ROW in this segment, and would also run parallel to or cross the following utilities:[5]

- 115 kV power lines
- Water pipelines
- Telecommunications lines
- Southern California Gas Company gas pipelines.

D.14.3.2 Banning and Beaumont

The Banning and Beaumont segment extends approximately 15 miles across land under the jurisdiction of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, unincorporated Riverside County, and the Cities of Banning and Beaumont. The Banning and Beaumont segment is marked by rapid residential and commercial development. New planned communities include the Sundance Development within the City of Beaumont, which is located south of the Proposed Project. A number of development projects have been proposed or are under construction within the Cities of Banning and Beaumont and unincorporated Riverside County, and are discussed in Section F.2, Cumulative Impact Analysis. The entire segment is located within Riverside County, California, and part of the segment is located within the Morongo Indian Reservation. The route would traverse 0.14 miles of agricultural land in this segment. Tables D.14-5 and D.14-6 above describe the population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities characteristics in Riverside County. Tables D.14-11 and D.14-12 above describe the population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities characteristics for the Morongo Indian Reservation. Table D.14-13 identifies the year 2000 Census population, housing, and employment statistics for the Cities of Banning and Beaumont.

Table D.14-13. Demographic Characteristics – Banning and Beaumont Segment

Location	2000 Population	2000 Housing	2000 Employment
City of Banning (Riverside Co, CA)	23,562	9,761 Vacancy Rate 8.6% (838 units)	7,507 10.9% in Construction Trades (818)
City of Beaumont (Riverside Co, CA)	11,384	4,258 Vacancy Rate 8.9% (377 units)	4,394 13.4% in Construction Trades (590)

Source: U.S. Census 2000 Lookup, http://factfinder.census.gov accessed February 2, 2006.

Table D.14-14 provides the public service and utility providers for the Devers Substation to East Border of Banning segment of the Proposed Project.

Within the Banning and Beaumont segment, the Proposed Project would run parallel to or cross the same types of utilities as described above for Section D.14.3.1, Devers Substation to East Border of Banning segment.

[5] Utility lines in the vicinity of the ROW were identified by SCE in its data deficiency responses and during field reconnaissance performed by Aspen Environmental Group on June 13-15, 2005.

Table D.14-14. Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction – Banning and Beaumont Segment

City of Banning (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Coachella Sanitary Landfill
Water – City of Banning Public Works Department	Fire protection – Banning Fire Department
Wastewater – City of Banning Public Works Department	Police protection – City of Banning Police Department
Telecommunications – Verizon	Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – Calvary Christian School
City of Beaumont (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Lamb Canyon Landfill
Water – City of Beaumont Water District	Fire protection – City of Beaumont Fire Department
Wastewater – City of Beaumont Wastewater Treatment Plant	Police protection – City of Beaumont Police Department
Telecommunications – Verizon	Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – Chavez Elementary School, Beaumont High School and Junior High

Sources: City of Banning, http://www.ci.banning.ca.us/default.asp?Page=1
City of Beaumont, http://www.ci.beaumont.ca.us
N/A – Information Not Publicly Available

D.14.3.3 Calimesa and San Timoteo Canyon

The Calimesa and San Timoteo Canyon segment extends approximately 11 miles across the Cities of Calimesa and Redlands and through unincorporated Riverside County into San Bernardino County. The proposed route would cross south of I-10 at the southeastern boundary of the City of Calimesa, and would continue across Calimesa's southwestern boundary within an existing 86-acre easement. The Calimesa and San Timoteo Canyon segment is characterized by growing residential and commercial development. While this segment is located within Riverside County, the City of Yucaipa (located within San Bernardino County) is located approximately two miles north of the Proposed Project and is considered part of the study area for this segment. A number of development projects that have been proposed or are under construction are discussed in Section F.2, Cumulative Impact Analysis. The Proposed Project would be constructed in proximity to residential uses in Calimesa, Redlands, and unincorporated Riverside County. Tables D.14-5 and D.14-6 above describe the population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities characteristics in Riverside County. Table D.14-15 identifies the year 2000 Census population, housing, and employment statistics for the other jurisdictions along this segment of the project route.

Table D.14-15. Demographic Characteristics – Calimesa and San Timoteo Canyon Segment

Location	2000 Population	2000 Housing	2000 Employment
San Bernardino County (CA)	1,709,434	601,369 Vacancy Rate 12.1% (72,775 units)	661,272 11.3% in Construction Trades (74,519)
City of Calimesa (Riverside Co, CA)	7,139	3,248 Vacancy Rate 8.2% (266 units)	2,825 7.7% in Construction Trades (217)
City of Yucaipa (San Bernardino Co, CA)	41,207	16,112 Vacancy Rate 5.7% (919 units)	17,264 13.3% in Construction Trades (2,289)

Source: U.S. Census 2000 Lookup, http://factfinder.census.gov accessed February 2, 2006.

Table D.14-16 provides the public service and utility providers for the Calimesa and San Timoteo Canyon segment of the Proposed Project.

Within the Calimesa and San Timoteo Canyon segment, the Proposed Project would run parallel to or cross the same types of utilities as described above for Section D.14.3.1, Devers Substation to East Border of Banning segment.

Table D.14-16. Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction – Calimesa and San Timoteo Canyon Segment

San Bernardino County	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas	Solid Waste (Landfills) – San Bernardino County Solid Waste Management Division
Water – East Valley Water District	Fire protection – San Bernardino Fire Department
Wastewater – San Bernardino County Public Works Department	Police protection – San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department
Telecommunications – Verizon, Adelphia, Wiltel Communications	Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
City of Calimesa (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas, Kinder Morgan Energy	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Badlands Landfill, Edom Hill Landfill, El Sobrante Landfill
Water – Western Municipal Water District	Fire protection – Riverside County Fire Department
Wastewater – Western Municipal Water District	Police protection – City of Calimesa Police Department
Telecommunications – Verizon	Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
City of Yucaipa (San Bernardino County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas	Solid Waste (Landfills) – San Timoteo Landfill, Yucaipa Landfill
Water – Yucaipa Valley Water District	Fire protection – City of Yucaipa Fire Department
Wastewater – Yucaipa Valley Water District	Police protection – City of Yucaipa Police Department
Telecommunications – Verizon	Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None

Sources: Western Municipal Water District, http://www.wmwd.com/index.htm
East Valley Water District, http://www.eastvalley.org
San Bernardino County Solid Waste Management Division, http://www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us/wsd
San Bernardino Sheriff's Department, http://www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us/sheriff
San Bernardino Fire Department, http://www.sbcfire.org
San Bernardino County, http://www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us
City of Calimesa, http://www.cityofcalimesa.net
City of Yucaipa, http://www.yucaipa.org

D.14.3.4 San Bernardino Junction to Vista Substation

The San Bernardino Junction to Vista Substation segment extends across San Bernardino County and the Cities of Loma Linda, Colton, and Grand Terrace. The Proposed Project would traverse south of I-10, and would involve upgrades and improvements to existing transmission structures within the SCE ROW. Upon crossing into the Cities of Colton and Grand Terrace, the proposed route traverses residential communities and commercial land uses. While this segment is located within San Bernardino County, the City of Riverside (located within Riverside County) is located approximately 1.5 miles south and consequently is also included as a part of the study area for this segment. Tables D.14-15 and D.14-16, above, describe the population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities characteristics in San Bernardino County. Table D.14-17 identifies the year 2000 Census population, housing, and employment statistics for the other jurisdictions within this segment of the project route.

Table D.14-17. Demographic Characteristics – San Bernardino Junction to Vista Substation Segment

Location	2000 Population	2000 Housing	2000 Employment
City of Riverside (Riverside Co, CA)	255,166	85,974 Vacancy Rate 4.3% (3,969 units)	106,805 11.5% in Construction Trades (12,247)
City of Colton (San Bernardino Co, CA)	47,662	15,680 Vacancy Rate 7.4% (1,160 units)	18,927 11.4% in Construction Trades (2,159)
City of Grand Terrace (San Bernardino Co, CA)	11,626	4,458 Vacancy Rate 5.3% (237 units)	5,917 9.2% in Construction Trades (545)
City of Loma Linda (San Bernardino Co, CA)	18,681	8,084 Vacancy Rate 6.8% (548 units)	8,208 3.2% in Construction Trades (264)

Source: U.S. Census 2000 Lookup, http://factfinder.census.gov accessed February 2, 2006.

Table D.14-18 provides the public service and utility providers for the San Bernardino Junction to Vista Substation segment of the Proposed Project.

Table D.14-18. Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction – San Bernardino Junction to Vista Substation Segment

City of Riverside (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas Water – Western Municipal Water, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Wastewater –Western Municipal Water District, City of Riverside Public Works Department Telecommunications – Verizon	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Badlands Landfill Fire protection – City of Riverside Fire Department Police protection – City of Riverside Police Department Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
City of Colton (San Bernardino County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas Water – City of Colton Public Utilities Department Wastewater – City of Colton Wastewater Treatment Plant Telecommunications – Pacific Bell	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Colton Landfill Fire protection – City of Colton Fire Department Police protection – City of Colton Police Department Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – Colton Elementary School
City of Grand Terrace (San Bernardino County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas Water – Riverside Highland Water Company Wastewater – City of Colton Wastewater Treatment Plant Telecommunications – AT&T, Pacific Bell	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Colton Landfill Fire protection – City of Grand Terrace Fire Department Police protection – City of Grand Terrace Police Department Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – Terrace View Elementary School
City of Loma Linda (San Bernardino County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas Water – City of Loma Linda Public Works Department Wastewater – City of Loma Linda Public Works Department Telecommunications – Verizon	Solid Waste (Landfills) – San Timoteo Landfill Fire protection – City of Loma Linda Fire Department Police protection – San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None

Sources: City of Riverside, http://www.riversideca.gov
City of Colton, http://www.ci.colton.ca.us
City of Grand Terrace, http://www.cityofgrandterrace.org/city_services/utility.html
City of Loma Linda, http://www.lomalinda-ca.gov

Within this segment, the Proposed Project would run parallel to or cross the same types of utilities as described above for Section D.14.3.1, Devers Substation to East Border of Banning segment.

D.14.3.5 San Bernardino Junction to San Bernardino Substation

The San Bernardino Junction to San Bernardino Substation segment extends approximately three miles across the Cities of Loma Linda and Redlands. This segment would cross to the north of I-10 at the northern boundary of the City of Loma Linda. The proposed route would travel adjacent to Hulda Crooks Park, and would traverse agricultural land in the City of Redlands. Upon crossing Beaumont Avenue in the City of Loma Linda, the region is heavily developed with residential, commercial, and industrial land uses. In addition to the existing developments, a number of new residential communities have been proposed or are being constructed adjacent to the proposed route. These developments are discussed in Section F.2, Cumulative Impact Analysis. Located approximately 10 miles northwest and northeast of the segment are the Cities of San Bernardino and Highland, respectively. Also within the study area is the City of Moreno Valley, approximately two miles southwest of this segment. This entire segment is located within San Bernardino County, California, and a portion of the segment is located within the City of Loma Linda. Tables D.14-15 and D.14-16, above, describe the population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities characteristics in San Bernardino County, while Tables D.14-17 and D.14-18, above, describe the population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities characteristics in the

City of Loma Linda. Table D.14-19 identifies the year 2000 Census population, housing, and employment statistics for the other jurisdictions within this segment of the project route.

Table D.14-20 provides the public service and utility providers for the San Bernardino Junction to San Bernardino Substation segment of the Proposed Project.

Table D.14-19. Demographic Characteristics – San Bernardino Junction to San Bernardino Substation Segment

Location	2000 Population	2000 Housing	2000 Employment
City of San Bernardino (San Bernardino Co, CA)	185,401	63,535 Vacancy Rate 11.3% (7,205 units)	62,289 11.4% in Construction Trades (7,126)
City of Highland (San Bernardino Co, CA)	44,605	14,858 Vacancy Rate 9.3% (1,380 units)	17,058 11.3% in Construction Trades (1,936)
City of Moreno Valley (Riverside Co, CA)	142,381	41,431 Vacancy Rate 5.3% (2,206 units)	56,429 11.32% in Construction Trades (6,377)
City of Redlands (Riverside Co, CA)	63,591	24,790 Vacancy Rate 4.8% (1,197 units)	29,942 7.0% in Construction Trades (2,097)

Source: U.S. Census 2000 Lookup, http://factfinder.census.gov accessed February 2, 2006.

Table D.14-20. Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction – San Bernardino Junction to San Bernardino Substation Segment

City of San Bernardino (San Bernardino County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas Water – City of San Bernardino Municipal Water Department Wastewater – City of San Bernardino Municipal Water Department Telecommunications – Verizon, SBC, AT&T	Solid Waste (Landfills) – City of San Bernardino Department of Public Works Solid Waste Management Division Fire protection – City of San Bernardino Fire Department Police protection – City of San Bernardino Police Department Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
City of Highland (San Bernardino County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas Water – East Valley Water District Wastewater – San Bernardino County Public Works Department Telecommunications – Verizon	Solid Waste (Landfills) – San Bernardino County Solid Waste Management Division Fire protection – San Bernardino County Fire Department Police protection – San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
City of Moreno Valley (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas Water – Western Municipal Water District Wastewater – Western Municipal Water District, Big Bear Area Regional Wastewater Agency Telecommunications – Verizon	Solid Waste (Landfills) – Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfill Fire protection – City of Moreno Valley Fire Department Police protection – Riverside County Sheriff's Department Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None
City of Redlands (Riverside County)	
Natural gas & electricity – SCE, Southern California Gas Water – Redlands Municipal Utilities Department Wastewater – Redlands Municipal Utilities Department Telecommunications – Verizon	Solid Waste (Landfills) – California Street Landfill Fire protection – City of Redlands Fire Department Police protection – City of Redlands Police Department Schools within One Mile of Proposed Project – None

Source: East Valley Water District, http://www.eastvalley.org
City of San Bernardino, http://www.ci.san-bernardino.ca.us
City of San Bernardino Municipal Water Department, http://www.sbcitywater.org
City of Highland, http://www.ci.highland.ca.us
City of Moreno Valley, http://www.moreno-valley.ca.us
City of Redlands, http://www.ci.redlands.ca.us/utilities

Within this segment, the Proposed Project would run parallel to or cross the same types of utilities as described above for Section D.14.3.1, Devers Substation to East Border of Banning segment.

D.14.4 Applicable Regulations, Plans, and Standards

D.14.4.1 Federal

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Under NEPA (42 United States Code (USC) 4321 et seq.), an EIS must discuss social and economic effects if they are related to the natural or physical effects, and the definition of "effects" includes economic and social factors. Consequently, an EIS must include an analysis of the Proposed 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.

D.14.4.2 State

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). 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.

Protection of Underground Infrastructure. The responsibilities of California utility operators working in the vicinity of utilities are detailed in Section 1, Chapter 3.1, "Protection of Underground Infrastructure," Article 2 of California Government Code 4216-4216.9. This law requires that an excavator must

contact a regional notification center at least two days prior to excavation of any subsurface installation. Any utility provider seeking to begin a project that may damage underground infrastructure can call Underground Service Alert, the regional notification center. Underground Service Alert will notify the utilities that may have buried lines within 1,000 feet of the project. Representatives of the utilities are required to mark the specific location of their facilities within the work area prior to the start of project activities in the area.

Similarly in Arizona, utility operators working in the vicinity of utilities are required under the Arizona State Underground Facilities Law, referred to as the Blue Stake Law, (ARS Chapter 2, Article 6.3, Sections 40-360.21 through 40-360.32.), to contact a regional notification center at least two days prior to any excavation, trenching, or other digging activities. This activity would result in all underground electric, water, gas, cable, or telecommunications lines within the vicinity of the project being marked as to their exact location.

California Integrated Waste Management Board Solid Waste Policies, Plans, and Regulations. The Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (PRC 40050 et. seq. or Assembly Bill (AB 939, codified in PRC 40000), administered by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), requires all local and county governments to adopt a Source Reduction and Recycling Element to identify means of reducing the amount of solid waste sent to landfills. This law set reduction targets at 25 percent by the year 1995 and 50 percent by the year 2000. To assist local jurisdictions in achieving these targets, the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991 (SWRR) requires all new developments to include adequate, accessible, and convenient areas for collecting and loading recyclable and green waste materials.

D.14.4.3 Local

Appendix 2, the Policy Screening Report (PSR), lists all applicable federal, State, and local government policies that were identified for this project. As described in the PSR, the Proposed Project was found to be consistent with most local plans and policies. The following socioeconomic policies were evaluated in the PSR and were found to warrant detailed analysis within Section D.14.6, Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project – Devers-Harquahala, and Section D.14.7, Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project – West of Devers.

- **La Paz County Comprehensive Plan: Land Use Element.** Land Use Element Policy 5.1 within the La Paz County Comprehensive Plan is applicable to the Proposed Project and would protect employment areas, commercial development, and interchange node areas from intrusion of other uses and inappropriate adjacent land uses
- **Maricopa County 2020 Comprehensive Plan: Economic Development Element.** Objective ED2 within the Maricopa County Comprehensive Plan is applicable to the Proposed Project which encourages employment opportunities proximate to housing
- **San Bernardino County General Plan: Economic Development Element.** Economic Development Element Policy D-41 within the San Bernardino County General Plan is applicable to the Proposed Project. Policy D-41 would implement strategies aimed at developing a balance between housing and employment opportunities for all residents
- **The City of Beaumont General Plan: Community Development Element.** Community Development Element Policy 7 within the City of Beaumont General Plan is applicable to the Proposed Project and states that the City of Beaumont will continue to maintain and conserve its existing residential neighborhoods

- **City of Blythe General Plan: Housing and Economic Development Elements.** The following programs and policies within the City of Blythe General Plan are applicable to the Proposed Project:
  - Housing Element Program 1-c. In the event that any low income housing is eliminated for any reason, require the owner of the land to relocate those residents affected
  - Housing Element Policy 4. Preserve existing numbers of mobile homes and consider proposals for additional well-designed parks at affordable rates
  - Housing Element Program 4-b. If a mobile home park is converted or destroyed, the owner of the land will be required to relocate residents to comparable accommodations, in accordance with applicable State law
  - Economic Development Element Policy 1. Maintain the important role of agriculture and agribusiness to the local economy and ensure the orderly and logical extension of urbanization into agricultural areas.
- **City of Banning General Plan.** Housing Element. Housing Element Policy 3 within the City of Banning General Plan is applicable to the Proposed Project and would minimize the displacement impacts occurring as a result of residential demolition
- **City of Cathedral City General Plan.** Housing Element. Housing Element Policy 1 within the Cathedral City General Plan is applicable to the Proposed Project and would ensure that the quality of dwelling units in existing neighborhoods is improved, conserved, rehabilitated and maintained
- **City of Desert Hot Springs General Plan: Housing Element.** Housing Element Policy 1B within the City of Desert Hot Springs General Plan is applicable to the Proposed Project and encourages the preservation of its existing housing stock.

D.14.5 Significance Criteria and Approach to Impact Assessment

This section explains how impacts are assessed in Section D.14, and Section D.14.5.1 presents the significance criteria on which impact determinations are based. In addition, Section D.14.5.2 lists the Applicant Proposed Measures (APMs) relevant to Section D.14, and Section D.14.5.3 lists all impacts identified for the Proposed Project and alternatives.

D.14.5.1 Significance Criteria

NEPA provides no specific thresholds of significance for socioeconomic impact assessment. Significance varies, depending on the setting of the proposed action (40 CFR 1508.27[a]), but 40 CFR 1508.8 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. CEQA Guidelines exclude discussion of significance criteria for economic impacts, which in themselves are not considered significant effects on the environment, and thus no significance criteria are established. Significance criteria for socioeconomics impacts are presented below.

- The Proposed Project would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere
- The Proposed Project would cause a substantial change in revenue for local businesses, government agencies, or Indian tribes
- The Proposed Project would disrupt existing utility systems or would cause a collocation accident

- The Proposed Project would require water, or would generate solid waste or wastewater that exceeds the ability of existing facilities to accommodate the new capacities
- The Proposed Project would require the construction of new public service facilities or require the expansion of existing facilities to accommodate an increased need for fire protection, police protection, schools, or other public services
- The Proposed Project would conflict with applicable land use plans and policies associated with socioeconomics, public services, or utilities.

D.14.5.2 Applicant Proposed Measures

APMs were identified by SCE in its CPCN Application to the CPUC. No specific APMs related to socioeconomics were identified by SCE in its CPCN Application.

D.14.5.3 Impacts Identified

Table D.14-22 lists the socioeconomic impacts identified for the Proposed Project and alternatives, along with the significance of each impact. Detailed discussions of each impact and the specific locations where each is identified are presented in the following sections. 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 impacts).

Table D.14-22. Impacts Identified – Socioeconomics

Impact No.	Description	Impact Significance
Proposed Project		
S-1	Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems.	Class III
S-2	Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities.	Class II and III
S-3	Project operation would provide revenue to the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians.	Class IV
S-4	Project operation would provide revenue to the Morongo Band of Mission Indians.	Class IV

Table D.14-22. Impacts Identified – Socioeconomics

Impact No.	Description	Impact Significance
SCE Harquahala-West Alternative		
S-1	Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems.	Class III
S-2	Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities.	Class III
SCE Palo Verde Alternative		
S-1	Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems..	Class III
S-2	Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities.	Class III
Harquahala Junction Switchyard Alternative		
S-1	Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems.	Class III
S-2	Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities.	Class III
Desert Southwest Transmission Project Alternative		
S-1	Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems.	Class III
S-2	Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities.	Class III
Alligator Rock–North of Desert Center Alternative		
S-1	Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems.	Class III
S-2	Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities.	Class III
Alligator Rock–Blythe Energy Transmission Alternative		
S-1	Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems.	Class III
S-2	Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities.	Class III
Alligator Rock–South of I-10 Frontage Alternative		
S-1	Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems.	Class III
S-2	Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities.	Class III
Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative		
S-1	Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems.	Class III
S-2	Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities.	Class III
S-4	Project operation would provide revenue to the Morongo Band of Mission Indians	No Impact

Demand For Housing and Additional Public Services. Construction employment for the Proposed Project and alternatives 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 Section B, Project Description (Table B-5, 500 kV Transmission Line Labor Force and Equipment Requirements), the workforce necessary for construction of the Proposed Project is anticipated to be a total of 211 personnel. Because at some stages of the project, multiple locations would be under construction simultaneously, a maximum estimated average daily workforce is used as a worst-case scenario for each portion of the Proposed Project.

For the Devers-Harquahala segments, the maximum daily workforce would be 211 personnel while the maximum daily workforce for the West of Devers segments would be 174 personnel. Although there are portions of the project route that have low populations, large local construction workforces are gene-

rally available throughout the project route due to large population centers in Maricopa, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties.

- In Maricopa County, the maximum required Proposed Project workforce of 211 personnel would comprise 0.14 percent of the total construction workforce available in the county.
- La Paz County has an estimated total construction workforce of 726 personnel, but it is anticipated that project construction in La Paz County would draw on the workforces of Riverside and Maricopa Counties.
- In Riverside County, the required Proposed Project workforce would comprise 0.30 percent and 0.24 percent of the total construction workforce available in the county for construction of the Devers-Harquahala segments and West of Devers segments, respectively.
- West of Devers construction in San Bernardino County would require 0.19 percent of the total San Bernardino County construction workforce.

Personnel for operation and maintenance would be drawn from local populations. Consequently, no workers are expected to relocate permanently during project construction and no new demand to local housing would be expected. Because no personnel are expected to permanently relocate as a part of the Proposed Project, the project would not result in new demand to local public services or facilities serving the Proposed Project route. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not necessitate the addition of new public service facilities serving the route. As no impacts would occur along the project route, demand for housing and additional public services are not discussed on a segment-by-segment basis.

Project Effects on Property Values. The CPUC, with recent transmission line EIRs, has experienced a high level of public concern associated with the siting of transmission lines and any associated impacts on property values. The State of California Energy Commission (CEC), in their review and licensing of several power plant projects between 2000 and 2003, received similar public input regarding concerns with power plant siting and property values. As a result, CEC Staff, in preparation of their Staff Assessments (CEQA-equivalent process) evaluating power plant projects, conducted thorough research of the literature on proximity impacts analysis for property values and cited the Kinnard-Dickey paper, A Primer on Proximity Impact Research: Residential Property Values Near High-Voltage Transmission Lines, as a comprehensive study on this topic. The CPUC has since also used this approach for addressing concerns regarding property values in three recent transmission line EIRs. Previous studies cited in the Kinnard-Dickey paper show that three procedures are used to measure the difference between sale prices, marketing periods and/or sales volume of properties in the proximity of transmission or distribution lines and those of competitive properties in control areas, which are not located in the proximity of transmission or distribution lines. The three procedures cited in the Kinnard-Dickey paper include:

- **Paired Sales Analysis.** Finding sales of properties within the impact area and comparing them with sales of similar, competitive properties in the control area. Any price differentials are noted, and any pattern of such differences is identified. More recent studies apply statistical testing procedures to the results when sufficient numbers of paired sales are available
- **Survey Research/Opinion.** This method is used as either a supplement or substitute for analysis of market sales transaction data. Potential purchasers either will or will not buy; they either will or will not pay the same or similar prices for proximate properties. It is important to note that Survey Research/Opinion merely reflects responses to hypothetical situations by interviewees who are not necessarily prospective buyers — especially in the impact area under study

- **Market Impact Studies Using Multiple Regression Analysis (MRA) in the Hedonic Pricing Model Format.** Gathering data files on as many market sales transactions as possible within the impact area and within one or more similar control areas over a specified time period — usually a few years prior to an awareness of the Proposed Project. The extended time period is used to identify and measure any price/value impact that might occur within the impact area after an awareness of the project occurs. This type of "before and after" analysis supplements the comparison of levels and trends and prices, marketing time, and sales volume within the impact area and those in the control area. The post-announcement sales information also provides a basis for testing the likely duration of any value impact that might be identified. The MRA approach to market proximity impact analysis is preferred in the current professional and academic literature because the model reflects what buyers and sellers actually do as opposed to what potential buyers say they might do under specified hypothetical circumstances. Further, the use of large sets of sales data indicates that the results are more representative of the market than those of the paired sales studies.

Studies cited in the Kinnard-Dickey paper show that three possible effects to the market value of residential properties have been claimed:

- **Diminished Price –** which is identified by comparing unit prices that are proximate to power lines to unit prices of similar and competitive properties more distant from power lines
- **Increased Marketing Time –** even when proximate properties sell at or near the same prices as more distant control properties, claimants argue that proximate properties take longer to sell. Such increased marketing time can represent a loss to the seller by deferring receipt, availability, and use of sale proceeds
- **Decreased Sales Volume –** a more subtle indicator of diminished property value if potential buyers decide not to buy in the impact area. A measurable decrease in sales volume in the impact area compared with sales volume in the control area where otherwise similar properties purportedly still are selling can represent evidence of decreased market value from proximity to the high voltage transmission lines (or claimed hazard).

The findings of the Kinnard-Dickey paper indicate the need to address a range of issues to more accurately analyze impacts on property values due to environmental changes. Issues that must be addressed to ensure accurate proximity impact analysis for property values include the following:

- The need to distinguish between fear of health hazards by current and potential residents and the market behavior of buyers and sellers in the same area; misleading to confuse opinion responses of hypothetical buyers based on fear with actual past and likely behavior of buyers in market areas identified as proximate to high voltage transmission lines or claimed hazard.
- Studies of both attitudes and market behavior of purchasers who are near sources of claimed hazards show that the more informed a potential buyer is, the less likely that buyer is to be deterred from purchasing near the claimed hazard. Knowledge of occurrence probabilities, awareness of findings of reproducible scientific studies, and understanding of the causal nexus (if any) lead to a greater willingness of the potential buyer to live near the claimed hazard, and has been found to minimize price effects on proximate residential properties.
- Some MRA studies indicate that any observed negative price, marketing time, and sales volume effects tend to be statistically insignificant; results could easily have occurred randomly or by chance. Therefore, they do not necessarily represent a consistent, systematic market response to locations proximate to high voltage transmission lines (or claimed hazard).

- In some MRA studies negative price effects in the range of five to nine percent were identified up to 200 feet distant from the edge of the high voltage transmission line ROW. These studies found that effective screening of views can diminish or eliminate the negative price effect. In addition, any observed negative value impacts decrease, and most likely disappear over time (four to ten years).
- While fear (whether reasonable or not) of health hazards is admissible in courts as an explanation of why diminution in property values has occurred, it is not a measure of the diminution in market value (amount) due to the lack of corroborating market sales data. Even if buyer attitudes have been influenced with the emerging support of fear concerns in both court cases and market-wide survey research studies, such studies focus directly on the attitudes and opinions of potential buyers, while market proximity impact studies reflect, identify, and measure the influence of those attitudes and opinions through actual market behavior.

According to the Kinnard-Dickey paper, issues requiring further research to determine impacts to property values, include:

- Conflicts with findings of paired sales studies and opinion/attitude survey research
- Consistency and comparability of results regarding property characteristics, characteristics of the claimed hazard, and variation of data availability among market areas at different times
- Buyer and seller behavior
- Preference for proximity impact analysis of recorded market sales versus survey research/opinion based on interviews and whether both are required to achieve appropriate market impact indicators.

In addition to a literature search on proximity analysis impacts, the CEC staff reviewed the Analysis of Property Value Impacts of the Crockett Cogeneration Project, submitted by the Applicant for the Crockett Cogeneration Project. The Crockett analysis cites several studies that examine the impacts on property values of very large industrial facilities. Such facilities include nuclear power plants, industrial waste incinerators, and landfills. As stated in the Crockett analysis, one or more of three methods were used to study impacts of property values:

- Hedonic pricing
- Contingent valuation
- Regression analysis of market sales data.

Hedonic pricing techniques analyze how the attributes of a good affect its price, and have been used in several of the studies to estimate the losses in sale price of homes due to possible exposure to technological or natural risks. The findings of previous studies in the Crockett analysis "yield an equivocal conclusion. Under some conditions facilities result in negative economic impacts and under other conditions they do not. Thus, even for very large facilities that are extreme in terms of their potential health, safety, and aesthetic impacts, there is no clear association with diminished economic impacts. Indeed, economic impacts are not clearly and reliably observed even for nuclear power generation facilities near residential properties" (Analysis of Property Value Impacts of the Crockett Cogeneration Project, Appendix X, Crockett Cogeneration Project, 1992).

Further, the Crockett analysis states that "there are many factors involved in purchasing a new home: affordability; age; size; schools; location; and so on, and it has simply not been demonstrated that a view obstruction would be a major factor in a property value decline" (Analysis of Property Value Impacts of the Crockett Cogeneration Project, Appendix X, Crockett Cogeneration Project, 1992).

The Kinnard-Dickey paper and the Crockett analysis cite several examples of proximity impact analyses, methodologies used to measure impacts, and types of possible proximity impacts on residential property values. Further, both studies conclude that differing, sometimes conflicting, findings have emerged from market studies. Despite the fact that many technical and conceptual issues remain untested and unresolved, the Kinnard-Dickey paper supports the use of the MRA in the Hedonic Pricing Model format, when a large data set of appropriately screened property sales is used.

In general, claims of diminished property value through decreased marketability are based on the reported concern about hazards to human health and safety; and increased noise, traffic, and visual impacts associated with living in proximity to locally unwanted land uses (LULUs) such as power plants, freeways, high voltage transmission lines, landfills, hazardous waste sites, etc. The issue of property value impacts associated with such industrial facilities has been given much attention over the past 20 years, and as a result, has been the subject of extensive study.

While it is possible that property owners near the Proposed Project may have the perception that their homes will diminish in value because of project implementation, the actual loss of property value and potential effects can only be tested through data from home sales. The MRA method, as supported by the Kinnard-Dickey paper, requires that data be collected on as many market sales transactions as possible within the impact area and within one or more similar control areas over a few years prior to an awareness of a project to accurately reflect what buyers and sellers actually do as opposed to what potential buyers say they might do under specified hypothetical circumstances. To assess what particular environmental and physical changes associated with the Proposed Project could affect property values within an immediate distance, a market study of current and future values of properties potentially affected by the Proposed Project would have to be conducted to evaluate property values with and without the Proposed Project being constructed. The data that would be required to conduct a more detailed analysis is unavailable, consequently, the conclusions of the Kinnard-Dickey paper and Crocket analysis are applied to this analysis. It is expected that the Proposed Project would not generate effects that would significantly impact property values.

Although there is evidence that transmission lines have affected property values in some cases, the effects are generally smaller than anticipated. Impacts on property values result from visual impacts, or health and safety concerns such as EMF. These issues and potential impacts are analyzed extensively in Section D.6 (Visual Resources) and Section D.11 (Public Health & Safety). Without the appropriate data to analyze this Proposed Project's impacts on property values, any conclusions regarding effects on property values would be speculative. In addition, the DPV2 Project as proposed would be constructed entirely within and adjacent to existing corridors where other transmission lines already exist. Incremental effects on property values that may result from the changes within the corridor resulting from this project would be very small and even more difficult to quantify.

Policy Consistency Analysis. Based on the analysis included in the PSR (Appendix 2), Table D.14-23 identifies the policies or guidelines pertaining to operational issues along the Proposed Project and alternative routes that were identified for further analysis. Table D.14-23 provides the consistency analysis for the socioeconomic policies or guidelines identified as applicable to the Proposed Project.

No conflicts with applicable plans and policies would occur. As no impacts would occur, consistency with plans and policies is not further discussed by segment.

Table D.14-23. Consistency with Applicable Socioeconomic Plans and Policies

Agency Regulating Land Use	Regulation or Policy	Project Consistent?	Basis for Consistency
La Paz County	La Paz County Comprehensive Plan		
Applicable Segment: Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge, Kofa National Wildlife Refuge, Kofa National Wildlife Refuge to Colorado River	Policy 5.1	Yes	This segment of the project route would not require the removal of any structures or intrude on any commercial uses, employment areas, or developed areas. All project developments would occur within an existing transmission line ROW or within rural land that does not contain development, and would not require the removal or intrusion on any adjacent business uses. Therefore, construction of this segment of the Proposed Project would be consistent with this Policy.
Maricopa County	Maricopa County General Plan		
Applicable Segment: Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge, Kofa National Wildlife Refuge	Objective ED-2	Yes	Construction of this segment of the Proposed Project is expected to utilize the local construction labor market for the required construction personnel. As indicated in Table D.14-1, this segment of the project area contains a large amount of residential housing. It is assumed that all new workers would come from within the local labor force serving the project area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would encourage new employment generated by construction and operation to the local labor force in areas served by ample residential housing. Therefore, construction of this segment of the Proposed Project would be consistent with this Objective.
City of Blythe	City of Blythe General Plan		
Applicable Segment: Palo Verde Valley (Colorado River to Midpoint Substation), Midpoint Substation, Midpoint Substation to Cactus City Rest Area	Housing Element Program 1-c	Yes	All construction elements of this segment of the Proposed Project would be included on BLM and Riverside County lands that do not contain or would not require the removal of any residential housing units. Therefore, no low-income housing within the City of Blythe would be removed. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this City of Blythe General Plan policy.
	Housing Element Policy 4	Yes	This segment of the Proposed Project would not require the removal of any residential housing units. Therefore, no mobile homes within the City of Blythe would be removed. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this City of Blythe General Plan policy.
	Housing Element Program 4-b	Yes	This segment of the Proposed Project would not require the removal of any residential housing units. Therefore, no mobile homes within the City of Blythe would be removed. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this City of Blythe General Plan policy.
	Economic Development Element Policy 1	Yes	Construction elements of this segment of the Proposed Project would require the removal of 2.2 acres of agricultural land from productivity. Although operation of the Proposed Project would result in reductions to agricultural business revenues, it would not represent the removal of agricultural businesses. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this City of Blythe General Plan policy.
City of Cathedral City	City of Cathedral City General Plan		
Applicable Segment: Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation	Housing Element Policy 1	Yes	This segment of the Proposed Project would not require the removal of any residential housing units. Therefore, no residential homes within the City of Cathedral City would be removed. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this City of Cathedral City General Plan policy.

Table D.14-23. Consistency with Applicable Socioeconomic Plans and Policies

Agency Regulating Land Use	Regulation or Policy	Project Consistent?	Basis for Consistency
City of Desert Hot Springs	City of Desert Hot Springs General Plan		
Applicable Segment: Devers Substation to East Border of Banning	Housing Element Policy 1B	Yes	All construction elements of this segment of the Proposed Project would be included on BLM, Riverside County, and Morongo Indian lands that do not contain or would require the removal of any residential housing units. Therefore, no housing within the City of Desert Hot Springs would be removed. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this City of Desert Hot Springs General Plan policy.
City of Beaumont	City of Beaumont General Plan		
Applicable Segment: Banning and Beaumont	Community Development Element Policy 7	Yes	All construction elements of this segment of the Proposed Project would be included on lands that do not contain or would not require the removal of any residential housing units. Therefore, no housing within the City of Beaumont would be removed. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this City of Beaumont General Plan policy.
City of Banning	City of Banning General Plan		
Applicable Segment: Banning and Beaumont	Housing Element Policy 3	Yes	All construction elements of this segment of the Proposed Project would be included on lands that do not contain or would require the removal of any residential housing units. Therefore, no housing within the City of Banning would be removed. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this City of Banning General Plan policy.
San Bernardino County	San Bernardino County General Plan		
Applicable Segments: Calimesa and San Timoteo Canyon, San Bernardino Junction to Vista Substation, San Bernardino Junction to San Bernardino Substation	Economic Development Element Policy D-41	Yes	As indicated in Table D.14-15, Demographic Characteristics – Calimesa and San Timoteo Canyon segment, this segment contains an estimated 147,999 person construction workforce. The maximum required construction workforce of 174 personnel required for this segment of the Proposed Project would comprise 0.12 percent of the total Calimesa and San Timoteo Canyon segment construction workforce. In addition, this segment contains 152,416 available housing units in the year 2000. The required construction workforce of 174 persons for this person would not impact the jobs housing balance for the area. Therefore, this segment of the Proposed Project would be consistent with this San Bernardino County General Plan Policy.

D.14.6 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project – Devers-Harquahala

This section presents a discussion of impacts and mitigation measures for the 500 kV portion of the DPV2 project. The discussion is divided into six geographic areas, three in Arizona and three in California. Within each area, both construction impacts and operational impacts are addressed.

D.14.6.1 Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Construction of this segment of the Proposed Project and related infrastructure has the potential to disrupt existing collocated utility lines such as gas pipelines and other electrical utility lines as a result of potential accidents within the existing DPV1 ROW. The expansion of existing ROW and acquisition of new ROW could result in the crossing or collocation of new towers and power lines on or adjacent to existing utility lines. As described above in Section D.14.2.1, Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge, natural gas pipelines and water canals share the ROW with the existing DPV1 line. Therefore, there would be potential for service interruptions of these utilities during construction of the Proposed Project. While this segment of the Proposed Project would run parallel to natural gas pipelines and water canals, there would be other utility crossings (e.g., water, sewer, electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, etc.) along the route.

However, as required by Arizona State Underground Facilities Law or, simply, the Blue Stake Law, (ARS Chapter 2, Article 6.3, Sections 40-360.21 through 40-360.32.), SCE would be required to contact a regional notification center at least two days prior to any excavation, trenching, or other digging activities. This activity would result in all underground electric, water, gas, cable, or telecommunications lines within the vicinity of the Proposed Project being marked as to their exact location. All aboveground utilities would be visible and coordination between SCE and the utility provider would occur to avoid utility disruptions during construction. After determining the location of existing utilities within the corridor, the exact placement of construction, whether it is for transmission towers, series capacitor banks, or telecommunications facilities, would be determined so that they would not conflict with other collocated utilities. With the application of these required activities, impacts related to a collocation or utility disruption would be adverse but less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class III)

Water. During project construction, water would be required for dust suppression and cleaning of construction equipment, as well as for cement mixing. The amount of water required depends on the length of access roads used, weather conditions, road surface conditions, and other site-specific conditions. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of this segment of the Proposed Project is estimated to use approximately 3.3 acre-feet (af) of water.

As identified in Table D.14-2, Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction – Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge Segment, when water is required, this segment of the project route is served by the Central Arizona Water District (CAWD), which gets water from the CAP. In 2005, the CAWD capacity

for both La Paz County and Maricopa Counties was 1.8 million af of water annually. Based on the CAWD capacity, construction of this segment would use approximately 0.0002 percent of the available annual water supply for the area. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the CAWD available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Furthermore, water use for construction purposes within this segment of the Proposed Project would be temporary and short-term in use. Therefore, water used during construction is not expected to substantially change the demands of the water suppliers identified in Table D.14-2, and would not require new or expanded potable water facilities, sources, or entitlements. Water demands of the Proposed Project would have an adverse but less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Solid waste generated within this segment of the Proposed Project would be limited to construction debris and soil removed during construction of tower footings. The debris from excavation of tower footings and foundations would be removed before the hole would be backfilled with soil and revegetated. This material, along with packing crates, spare bolts, and other construction debris would be hauled offsite for recycling or disposal at local landfills. Soil from drilling or excavation for new tower foundations would be screened and separated for use as backfill materials at the site of origin to the maximum extent possible. Spoils unsuitable for backfill use would be disposed of at appropriate disposal sites. The generation of this solid waste would be limited to project construction. As identified in Table D.14-2, Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction – Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge Segment, this segment of the project route is served by a variety of local landfills. The volume of waste generated by project construction in this segment would be very small compared to the capacities of these landfills. These landfills would have a capacity adequate to receive solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project. Adverse but less than significant impacts to solid waste facilities would occur (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified for the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment.

D.14.6.2 Kofa National Wildlife Refuge

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

In the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment, the Proposed Project would share the ROW with the DPV1 500 kV line and the El Paso Natural Gas pipeline. Impacts in this segment would be generally the same as discussed above for Section D.14.6.1, Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment. As indicated in that section, compliance with the Arizona State Underground Facilities Law would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class III)

Water. Water use for the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment would be the same as described above for Section D.14.6.1, Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment, although the amount of water would be different. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of this segment of the Proposed Project is estimated to use approximately 1.5 af of water.

This segment of the project route is served by the CAWD. As discussed above for Section D.14.6.1, Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment, the CAWD capacity for both La Paz County and Maricopa County is 1.8 million af of water annually. Based on the CAWD capacity, construction of this segment would use approximately 0.00008 percent of the available annual water supply for the area. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the CAWD available water supply that would result in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Water demands of the Proposed Project would have an adverse but less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in this segment would be the same as discussed above for Section D.14.6.1, Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment. This segment of the project route is served by a variety of local landfills. The volume of waste generated by project construction in this segment would be very small compared to the capacities of these landfills. The landfills would have a capacity adequate to receive solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project. Less than significant impacts to solid waste facilities would occur, and no mitigation is required (Class III).

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified for the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment.

D.14.6.3 Kofa National Wildlife Refuge to Colorado River

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Impacts in this segment would be the same as discussed above for Section D.14.6.1, Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge and Section D.14.6.2, Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segments. Compliance with the Arizona State Underground Facilities Law would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class III)

Water. Water uses for the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge to Colorado River segment would be the same as described above in Sections D.14.6.1 and D.14.6.2, although the amount of water would be different. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of this segment of the Proposed Project is estimated to use approximately 4.2 af of water. The water required for this segment would represent 0.0002 percent of the 1.8 million af available annually from CAWD supplies in La Paz and Maricopa Counties. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in this segment would be the same as discussed above for Section D.14.6.1, Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge, and Section D.14.6.2, Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. This segment of the project route is served by a variety of local landfills. The volume of waste generated by project construction in this segment would be very small compared to the capacities of these landfills.

The landfills would have a capacity adequate to receive solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project. Less than significant impacts to solid waste facilities would occur, and no mitigation is required (Class III).

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge to Colorado River segment.

D.14.6.4 Palo Verde Valley (Colorado River to Midpoint Substation)

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Impacts in this segment would be the same as discussed above for the other Harquahala to Devers segments, although utilities potentially affected by the project would also include canals, laterals, and other irrigation infrastructure operated and maintained by the Palo Verde Irrigation District. According to Section 1, Chapter 3.1, "Protection of Underground Infrastructure," Article 2 of California Government Code 4216-4216.9, SCE is required to contact a regional notification center at least two days prior to excavation of any subsurface installation. This activity would result in Underground Service Alert notifying the utilities that may have buried lines within 1,000 feet of the project. Representatives of the utilities are required to mark the specific location of their facilities within the work area prior to the start of project activities in the area. This activity would result in all underground electric, water, gas, cable or telecommunications lines within the vicinity of the Proposed Project being marked as to their exact location. Compliance with the California Government Code 4216-4216.9 would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class III)

Water. Water uses for the Palo Verde Valley (Colorado River to Midpoint Substation) segment would be the same as described above for the other Harquahala to Devers segments, although the amount of water would be different. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of this segment of the Proposed Project is estimated to use approximately 0.5 af of water.

As identified in Table D.14-6, Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction – Palo Verde Valley (Colorado River to Midpoint Substation) Segment, when water is required, this segment of the project route is served by the Eastern Municipal Water District within Riverside County, which gets its water from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). In 2005, the MWD had an available water supply of 1.7 million af of water annually. Based on the MWD capacity, construction of this segment would use approximately 0.00002 percent of the available annual water supply of the MWD. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the MWD available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in this segment would be the same as discussed above for the previously discussed segments. The volume of waste generated by project construction in this segment would be very small compared to the capacities of the landfills serving this segment. Consequently, the landfills would have a capacity adequate to receive solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project. Less than significant impacts to solid waste facilities would occur, and no mitigation is required (Class III).

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified for the Palo Verde Valley (Colorado River to Midpoint Substation) segment.

D.14.6.5 Midpoint Substation

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Impacts related to construction accidents at the Midpoint Substation would be the same as discussed above for the previously discussed segments. Compliance with California Government Code 4216-4216.9 would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class III)

Water. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of the Midpoint Substation is estimated to use approximately 0.9 af of water. The water required for this segment would represent 0.00005 percent of the 1.7 million af available annually from MWD supplies in Riverside County. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in the Midpoint Substation segment would be the same as discussed above for the previously discussed segments. The volume of waste generated by project construction in this segment would be very small compared to the capacities of the landfills serving this segment. Consequently, the landfills would have a capacity adequate to receive solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project. Less than significant impacts to solid waste facilities would occur, and no mitigation is required (Class III).

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified for the Midpoint Substation.

D.14.6.6 Midpoint Substation to Cactus City Rest Area

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Impacts in this segment would be the same as discussed above for the previously discussed segments. Compliance with California Government Code 4216-4216.9 would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class III)

Water. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of the Midpoint Substation to Cactus City Rest Area segment of the Proposed Project is estimated to use approximately 4.6 af of water. The water required for this segment would represent 0.0003 percent of the 1.7 million af available annually from MWD supplies in Riverside County. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in this segment would be the same as discussed above for the previously discussed segments. The volume of waste generated by project construction in this segment would be very small compared to the capacities of the landfills serving this segment. Consequently, the landfills would have a capacity adequate to receive solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project. Less than significant impacts to solid waste facilities would occur, and no mitigation is required (Class III).

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified for the Midpoint Substation to Cactus City Rest Area segment.

D.14.6.7 Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Impacts in this segment would be the same as discussed above for the previously discussed segments. Compliance with California Government Code 4216-4216.9 would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class III)

Water. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of this segment of the Proposed Project is estimated to use approximately 2.5

af of water. The water required for this segment would represent 0.0001 percent of the 1.7 million af available annually from MWD supplies in Riverside County. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in this segment would be the same as discussed above for the previously discussed segments. The volume of waste generated by project construction in this segment would be very small compared to the capacities of the landfills serving this segment. Consequently, the landfills would have a capacity adequate to receive solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project. Less than significant impacts to solid waste facilities would occur, and no mitigation is required (Class III).

Operational Impacts

Impact S-3: Project operation would provide revenue to the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians (Class IV)

As described in Section D.4, Land Use, the Proposed Project would traverse allottee lands under the jurisdiction of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians. The Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians stated in a December 16, 2005 letter to the BLM and CPUC that under a 1979 ordinance passed by the Tribe that the Proposed Project would require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for SCE to cross the fee lands with the transmission line. SCE has stated that the Proposed Project would traverse allotments that are owned by tribal members, but that these allotments are not within the boundaries of the reservation. As of the writing of this Draft EIR/EIS, SCE and the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians still need to resolve issues of land acquisition for the Proposed Project. Any fees paid to the Agua Caliente as part of SCE obtaining the CUP would generate revenue for members of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians. Similarly, if it is determined that a CUP is not necessary, any compensation provided to the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians as a part of negotiations over the land would also provide revenue for the Agua Caliente. Revenue generation would be considered a beneficial impact to the Tribe. Therefore, under the Proposed Project, payments made by SCE to the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians in the form of fees or compensation would provide a beneficial socioeconomic impact (Class IV).

D.14.7 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project – West of Devers

This section presents a discussion of impacts and mitigation measures for the 230 kV portion of the DPV2 project. The discussion is divided into five geographic areas within Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, California. Within each area, both construction impacts and operational impacts are addressed.

D.14.7.1 Devers Substation to East Border of Banning

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

As opposed to the Devers-Harquahala segments of the project that passes through rural lands, the Devers Substation to East Border of Banning segment, along with the other West of Devers segments of the proj-

ect, largely passes through developed and residential lands, within an existing SCE corridor. Consequently, in addition to crossing existing electrical and natural gas lines, this segment of the Proposed Project has the potential to cross utility lines such as water, telecommunications, and drainage/sewerage lines.

As described above for the other segments of the project, however, SCE is required to comply with Section 1, Chapter 3.1, "Protection of Underground Infrastructure," Article 2 of California Government Code 4216-4216.9. The activities associated with compliance with California Government Code 4216-4216.9 would reduce the potential impact related to a collocation or utility disruption to a less than significant level (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class II and Class III)

Water. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of this segment of the Proposed Project is estimated to utilize approximately 4.0 af of water. The water required for this segment would represent 0.0002 percent of the 1.7 million af available annually from MWD supplies in Riverside County. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. As described in Section B.3.7.8, Removal of Facilities and Waste Disposal, during project construction of the Devers Substation to East Border of Banning segment, materials would be recycled where feasible. Approximately 750 tons of tower steel and hardware and approximately 2,050 tons of conductor would be recycled as part of the Proposed Project. Approximately 33,660 feet of treated wood poles would be removed and disposed of as part of the Proposed Project. For wood pole disposal, SCE would use landfill facilities authorized to accept treated wood products: Waste Management, Inc. (McKittrick Landfill with a maximum permitted throughput of 1,180 tons per day) and Clean Harbors Environmental Services (Buttonwillow Landfill with a maximum permitted throughput of 10,482 tons per day). Typically, at a jobsite where wood pole waste would be generated, SCE would contract with McFarland Cascade for all aspects of disposal, including hauling and paperwork. In the future, SCE could use other landfill facilities that are authorized to accept treated wood waste in accordance with the California Health and Safety Code Section 25143.1.5. Insulators and other non-recyclable materials would be hauled by a third party to local landfills. Concrete waste would be disposed of by the subcontractor hired by the principal contractor. Typically, rejected concrete is hauled back to the batch plant in the delivery truck. Concrete truck equipment would be washed out into shallow lined pits or bins. Once the material dries, it would be broken into small pieces and disposed of per local regulations by the contractor.

Although the landfills identified by SCE and serving this segment should adequately handle the solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project, the amounts of steel and wood waste generated by removal of towers could result in potentially significant impacts (Class II) to solid waste facilities. Implementation of Mitigation Measure S-2a (Recycle construction waste) would reduce impacts resulting from construction activities to a less than significant level (Class II) by ensuring that a minimum of 50 percent of the waste generated would be recycled.

Mitigation Measure for Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities

S-2a **Recycle construction waste.** To comply with the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, during project construction SCE and/or its construction contractor shall recycle a minimum of 50 percent of the waste generated during construction activities. Prior to the start of construction, SCE shall provide the CPUC/BLM with a letter explaining how it will comply with this requirement.

Operational Impacts

Impact S-4: Project operation would provide revenue to the Morongo Band of Mission Indians (Class IV)

Under the Proposed Project, SCE would be required to lease ROW land under the jurisdiction of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians for construction of this segment. This lease would provide annual income to the Morongo Band of Mission Indians for use of the land by SCE for facilities and infrastructure. This impact is considered beneficial as the lease would generate revenue for the Morongo Band of Mission Indians. Therefore, under the Proposed Project, ROW land leased from the Morongo Band of Mission Indians would provide a beneficial socioeconomic impact (Class IV).

D.14.7.2 Banning and Beaumont

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Impacts in this segment would be the same as discussed above for Section D.14.7.1, Devers Substation to East Border of Banning. Compliance with California Government Code 4216-4216.9 would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class II and Class III)

Water. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of this segment of the Proposed Project is estimated to use approximately 4.3 af of water. The water required for this segment would represent 0.0003 percent of the 1.7 million af available annually from MWD supplies in Riverside County. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in this segment would be the same as discussed above for Section D.14.7.1, Devers Substation to East Border of Banning segment. Although the landfills identified by SCE and serving this segment should adequately handle the solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project, the amounts of steel and wood waste generated by removal of towers would result in potentially significant impacts (Class II) to solid waste facilities. Implementation of Mitigation Measure S-2a (Recycle construction waste) would reduce impacts resulting from construction activities to less than significant levels by ensuring that a minimum of 50 percent of the waste generated would be recycled.

Mitigation Measure for Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities

S-2a Recycle construction waste.

Operational Impacts

Impact S-4: Project operation would provide revenue to the Morongo Band of Mission Indians (Class IV)

As described above for the Devers Substation to East Border of Banning segment (Section D.14.7.1), SCE would be required to lease a ROW through land owned by the Morongo Band of Mission Indians. Consequently, impacts would be the same as described above. The lease of a ROW from the Morongo Band of Mission Indians would provide a beneficial socioeconomic impact (Class IV).

D.14.7.3 Calimesa and San Timoteo Canyon

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Impacts in this segment would be the same as discussed above for the previously discussed segments. Compliance with California Government Code 4216-4216.9 would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class II and Class III)

Water. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of the Calimesa and San Timoteo Canyon segment of the Proposed Project is estimated to utilize approximately 3.0 af of water. The water required for this segment would represent 0.0002 percent of the 1.7 million af available annually from MWD supplies in Riverside County. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in this segment would be the same as discussed above for the other West of Devers segments. Although the landfills identified by SCE and serving this segment should adequately handle the solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project, the amounts of steel and wood waste generated by removal of towers could potentially result in significant impacts (Class II) to solid waste facilities. Implementation of Mitigation Measure S-2a (Recycle construction waste) would reduce impacts resulting from construction activities to less than significant levels by ensuring that a minimum of 50 percent of the waste generated would be recycled.

Mitigation Measure for Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities

S-2a Recycle construction waste.

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified in the Calimesa and San Timoteo Canyon segment.

D.14.7.4 San Bernardino Junction to Vista Substation

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Impacts in the San Bernardino Junction to Vista Substation segment would be the same as previously discussed above for the West of Devers segments (Sections D.14.7.1 through D.14.7.3). Compliance with California Government Code 4216-4216.9 would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class II and Class III)

Water. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of the San Bernardino Junction to Vista Substation segment of the Proposed Project is estimated to use approximately 1.0 af of water. The water required for this segment would represent 0.00006 percent of the 1.7 million af available annually from MWD supplies in Riverside County. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in this segment would be the same as discussed above for the other West of Devers segments (Sections D.14.7.1 through D.14.7.3). Although the landfills identified by SCE and serving this segment should adequately handle the solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project, the amounts of steel and wood waste generated by removal of towers would result in potentially significant impacts (Class II) to solid waste facilities. Implementation of Mitigation Measure S-2a (Recycle construction waste) would reduce impacts resulting from construction activities to less than significant levels by ensuring that a minimum of 50 percent of the waste generated would be recycled.

Mitigation Measure for Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities

S-2a Recycle construction waste.

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified for the San Bernardino Junction to Vista Substation segment.

D.14.7.5 San Bernardino Junction to San Bernardino Substation

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Impacts in the San Bernardino Junction to San Bernardino Substation segment would be the same as discussed above for the previously discussed West of Devers segments (Sections D.14.7.1 through D.14.7.3). Compliance with California Government Code 4216-4216.9 would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class II and Class III)

Water. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of the San Bernardino Junction to San Bernardino Substation segment of the Proposed Project is estimated to use approximately 8.4 af of water. The water required for this segment would represent 0.0009 percent of the 0.95 million af available annually from MWD supplies for this area. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in this segment would be the same as discussed above for the other West of Devers segments (Sections D.14.7.1 through D.14.7.3). Although the landfills identified by SCE and serving this segment should adequately handle the solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project, the amounts of steel and wood waste generated by removal of towers would result in potentially significant impacts (Class II) to solid waste facilities. Implementation of Mitigation Measure S-2a (Recycle Construction Waste) would reduce impacts resulting from construction activities to less than significant levels by ensuring that a minimum of 50 percent of the waste generated would be recycled.

Mitigation Measure for Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities

S-2a Recycle construction waste.

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified in the San Bernardino Junction to San Bernardino Substation segment.

D.14.8 Alternatives for Devers-Harquahala

D.14.8.1 SCE Harquahala-West Alternative

Environmental Setting

The SCE Harquahala-West Alternative consists of a 21-mile route that would begin at the Harquahala Switchyard. The SCE Harquahala-West Alternative would depart the Harquahala Switchyard to the west and follow section lines due west for approximately 12 miles through private and State lands to the El Paso Natural Gas pipeline corridor. Leaving Harquahala, the alternative route would traverse 8.5 miles of farmland prior to turning northwest and joining the El Paso Natural Gas pipeline corridor. At the pipeline corridor, the transmission line would proceed northwesterly along the pipeline corridor for approximately nine miles to the intersection with the DPV1 transmission line, immediately north of the El Paso Wendon Pump Station. The SCE Harquahala-West Alternative would travel through both La Paz County and Maricopa County, Arizona. Population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities data would be the same as described above for the Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment.

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Although the SCE Harquahala-West Alternative would not follow the DPV1 ROW and would not cross the CAP canal, construction of this alternative has the potential to disrupt existing utility lines such as gas pipelines, other electrical utility lines, irrigation canals, laterals, or other water infrastructure as a result of potential collocation accidents within the new ROW required by this alternative. It is expected that this alternative would have the potential to impact some of the same utilities serving Maricopa and La Paz Counties as described above in Section D.14.2.1, Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. Within the proposed alternative ROW, natural gas and telecommunications lines would share the ROW with the proposed alternative line. Therefore, there would be potential for service interruptions of these utilities during construction of this alternative.

Impacts in this alternative would be the same as discussed above for Section D.14.2.1, Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment. Compliance with the Arizona State Underground Facilities Law would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class III)

Water. Water uses for the SCE Harquahala-West Alternative would be the same as described above for Section D.14.6.1, Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment, although the amount of water would be different. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of this alternative is estimated to use approximately 2.5 af of water. The water required for this alternative would represent 0.0001 percent of the 1.8 million af available annually from CAWD supplies in La Paz and Maricopa Counties. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of this alternative would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in this alternative would be the same as discussed above for Section D.14.2.1, Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment. The volume of waste generated by project construction in this segment would be very small compared to the capacities of the landfills serving this segment. Consequently, the landfills would have a capacity adequate to receive solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project. Less than significant impacts to solid waste facilities would occur, and no mitigation is required (Class III).

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified in the SCE Harquahala-West Alternative.

D.14.8.2 SCE Palo Verde Alternative

Environmental Setting

The SCE Palo Verde Alternative would require construction of a new 14.7-mile 500 kV transmission line parallel to the DPV1 transmission line originating from the PVNGS switchyard instead of the Harquahala Switchyard. This alternative route would leave PVNGS switchyard following the DPV1 ROW west, then turning northwest. The new line would cross from the eastern side of the DPV1 transmission line to the east, and continue north, paralleling the existing DPV1 lines. The alternative would cross predominantly BLM land from PVNGS to the northwest past Saddle Mountain, but would also traverse 5.9 miles of agricultural land. The SCE Palo Verde Alternative would travel through both La Paz County and Maricopa County, Arizona. Consequently, population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities would be the same as described above for the Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment.

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Impacts in the SCE Palo Verde Alternative would be the same as discussed above for the Devers to Harquahala segments of the Proposed Project (Sections D.14.6.1 through D.14.6.7) as well as for the SCE Harquahala-West Alternative (Section D.14.8.1). Compliance with the Arizona State Underground Facilities Law would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class III)

Water. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of the SCE Palo Verde Alternative is estimated to use approximately 4.1 af of water. The water required for this alternative would represent 0.0002 percent of the 1.8 million af available annually from MWD supplies in Riverside County. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of this alternative would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in the SCE Palo Verde Alternative would be the same as discussed above for Section D.14.2.1, Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. The volume of waste generated by project construction in this segment would be very small compared to the capacities of the landfills serving this segment. Consequently, the landfills would have a capacity adequate to receive solid waste generated

during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project. Less than significant impacts to solid waste facilities would occur, and no mitigation is required (Class III).

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified in the SCE Palo Verde Alternative.

D.14.8.3 Harquahala Junction Switchyard Alternative

Environmental Setting

The Harquahala Junction Switchyard Alternative would require construction of a new switching station east of the Harquahala Generating Station, at the point where the existing Harquahala-Hassayampa and DPV1 transmission lines diverge. Under this alternative, the Harquahala Junction Switchyard would be built on a site of between six and 40 acres in the southwest quarter of Section 25, Township 2 North, Range 8 West, near the intersection of 451st Avenue and the Thomas Road alignment in unincorporated Maricopa County, Arizona. Population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities would be the same as described above for the Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment. Because the DPV2 500 kV line would originate from the Harquahala Junction Switchyard instead of PVNGS or Harquahala Switchyard, no agricultural land would be traversed by this alternative.

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Impacts in the Harquahala Junction Switchyard Alternative would be the same as discussed above for the Devers to Harquahala segments of the Proposed Project (Sections D.14.6.1 through D.14.6.7) as well as for the previously discussed alternatives (Sections D.14.8.1 through D.14.8.2). Compliance with the Arizona State Underground Facilities Law would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class III)

Water. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of the Harquahala Junction Switchyard Alternative is estimated to use approximately 3.8 af of water. The water required for this alternative would represent 0.0002 percent of the 1.8 million af available annually from MWD supplies in Riverside County. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of this alternative would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in this alternative would be the same as discussed above for Section D.14.6.1, Harquahala to Kofa National Wildlife Refuge segment, as well as the previously discussed alternatives. The volume of waste generated by project construction in this segment would be very small compared to the capacities of the landfills serving this segment. Consequently, the landfills would have a capacity adequate to receive solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project. Less than significant impacts to solid waste facilities would occur, and no mitigation is required (Class III).

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified for the Harquahala Junction Switchyard Alternative.

D.14.8.4 Desert Southwest Transmission Project Alternative

Environmental Setting

The Desert Southwest Transmission Line Alternative is an approximately 118-mile alternative transmission line that would originate at a new 25-acre Keim Substation/Switching Station on the south side of Hobsonway east of the center of Blythe and terminate at the Devers Substation. This alternative would travel through Riverside County, California; the Cities of Blythe, Coachella, and Cathedral City; and the unincorporated community of Desert Center. The alternative would travel north of the Cities of Indio, Palm Desert, Palm Springs, and Rancho Mirage. This alternative would traverse 1.6 miles of agricultural land. Population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities would be the same as described above for the Palo Verde Valley (Colorado River to Midpoint Substation), Midpoint Substation to Cactus City Rest Area, and Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation segments.

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Although the Desert Southwest Transmission Line Alternative would follow a slightly different alignment than the Proposed Project, the types of utilities that would be potentially impacted by this alternative and the potential impacts to them would be the same as the Proposed Project. Compliance with California Government Code 4216-4216.9 would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class III)

Water. Water uses for the Desert Southwest Transmission Line Alternative would be the same as described above for Section D.14.6.4, Palo Verde Valley (Colorado River to Midpoint Substation), Section D.14.6.6, Midpoint Substation to Cactus City Rest Area, and Section D.14.6.7, Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation, although the amount of water would be different. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of this alternative is estimated to use approximately 6.1 af of water. The water required for this alternative would represent 0.0003 percent of the 1.7 million af available annually from MWD supplies in Riverside County. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of this alternative would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in this alternative would be the same as discussed above for Section D.14.6.4, Palo Verde Valley (Colorado River to Midpoint Substation), Section D.14.6.6, Midpoint Substation to Cactus City Rest Area, and Section D.14.6.7, Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation segments. The volume of waste generated by project construction would be very small compared to the capacities of the landfills serving the area. Consequently, the landfills would have a capacity adequate to receive solid waste generated during construction of the alternative. Less than significant impacts to solid waste facilities would occur, and no mitigation is required (Class III).

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified for the Desert Southwest Transmission Project Alternative.

D.14.8.5 Alligator Rock–North of Desert Center Alternative

Environmental Setting

The Alligator Rock–North of Desert Center Alternative route would diverge from the Proposed Project route and would head northwest for approximately 1.5 miles before crossing I-10 to the north and continuing for 1.1 miles to an unnamed east-west dirt road along the section line. The route would then turn to the west and would parallel the roadway for approximately 1.4 miles before turning again to the northwest for 0.6 miles. The route would then turn west along another east-west section line, staying just within BLM land (north of private land at Desert Center) for another 0.6 miles before heading southwest for 15 miles to Ragsdale Road. The route would parallel Ragsdale Road and I-10 to the north for 3.6 miles before crossing back to the south of Ragsdale Road and I-10 to rejoin the proposed route 1.5 miles later. The 11.8-mile route would be entirely on BLM land, within Riverside County near the community of Desert Center. Population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities would be the same as described above for the Midpoint Substation to Cactus City Rest Area segment.

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Although the Alligator Rock–North of Desert Center Alternative would follow a slightly different alignment than the Proposed Project, the types of utilities that would be potentially impacted by this alternative and the potential impacts to them would be the same as the Proposed Project. Impacts in this alternative would be the same as discussed above for the Midpoint Substation to Cactus City Rest Area segment of the Proposed Project (Section D.14.6.6). Compliance with California Government Code 4216-4216.9 would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class III)

Water. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of this alternative is estimated to use approximately 4.8 af of water. The water required for this alternative would represent 0.0003 percent of the 1.8 million af available annually from MWD supplies in Riverside County. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of this alternative would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in this alternative would be the same as discussed above for Section D.14.6.6, Midpoint Substation to Cactus City Rest Area segment. The volume of waste generated by project construction in this segment would be very small compared to the capacities of the landfills serving this segment. Consequently, the landfills would have a capacity adequate to receive solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project. Less than significant impacts to solid waste facilities would occur, and no mitigation is required (Class III).

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified for the Alligator Rock–North of Desert Center Alternative.

D.14.8.6 Alligator Rock–Blythe Energy Transmission Alternative

Environmental Setting

The Alligator Rock–Blythe Energy Transmission Alternative would follow the proposed Blythe Energy Project Transmission Line (BEPTL) by diverging from DPV1 to the north bringing this new alignment close to Aztec Avenue, an existing El Paso natural gas pipeline/access road, which would be used for construction access. The alternative would diverge approximately 3.5 miles east of Desert Center at the point where the DPV1/DPV2 line turns west-southeast, continue northwest towards I-10 paralleling Aztec Avenue for approximately 2.25 miles, before turning west and paralleling the southern side of I-10 as well as Aztec Avenue for 1.0 mile. At this point the route would turn back toward the Proposed Project to the southwest and would parallel an access road along the eastern side of Alligator Rock for approximately 1.25 miles, where it would rejoin the proposed DPV2 project at about Proposed Project Milepost 155. The alternative route would be approximately 4.6 miles long within Riverside County near the community of Desert Center. Population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities would be the same as described above for the Midpoint Substation to Cactus City Rest Area segment.

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Impacts in the Alligator Rock–Blythe Energy Transmission Alternative would be the same as discussed above for Section D.14.8.5, Alligator Rock–North of Desert Center Alternative. Compliance with California Government Code 4216-4216.9 would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class III)

Water. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of the Alligator Rock–Blythe Energy Transmission Alternative is estimated to use approximately 4.6 af of water. The water required for this alternative would represent 0.0003 percent of the 1.8 million af available annually from MWD supplies in Riverside County. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of this alternative would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in this alternative would be the same as discussed above for Section D.14.8.5, Alligator Rock–North of Desert Center Alternative. The volume of waste generated by project construction in this segment would be very small compared to the capacities of the landfills serving this segment. Consequently, the landfills would have a capacity adequate to receive solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project. Less than significant impacts to solid waste facilities would occur, and no mitigation is required (Class III).

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified for the Alligator Rock–North of Desert Center Alternative.

D.14.8.7 Alligator Rock–South of I-10 Frontage Alternative

Environmental Setting

The Alligator Rock–South of I-10 Frontage Alternative would diverge from the Proposed Project approximately 3.5 miles east of Desert Center, and would follow the Alligator Rock–Blythe Energy Transmission Route Alternative route for 3.25 miles to the point at which point it turns southwest, just east of Alligator Rock. After passing between the northern end of Alligator Rock and the I-10 itself, this alternative would continue in a westerly direction, immediately south of I-10 and Aztec Avenue for 6.3 miles. The Alligator Rock–South of I-10 Frontage Alternative would be 9.77 miles long within Riverside County near the community of Desert Center. Population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities would be the same as described above for the Midpoint Substation to Cactus City Rest Area segment.

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Impacts in the Alligator Rock–South of I-10 Frontage Alternative would be the same as discussed above for the previous Alligator Rock alternatives (Sections D.14.8.5 and D.14.8.6). Compliance with California Government Code 4216-4216.9 would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class III)

Water. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of the Alligator Rock–South of I-10 Frontage Alternative is estimated to use approximately 4.9 af of water. The water required for this alternative would represent 0.0003 percent of the 1.8 million af available annually from MWD supplies in Riverside County. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of this alternative would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Impacts in this alternative would be the same as discussed above for the previous Alligator Rock alternatives (Sections D.14.8.5 and D.14.8.6). The volume of waste generated by project construction in this segment would be very small compared to the capacities of the landfills serving this segment. Consequently, the landfills would have a capacity adequate to receive solid waste generated during construction of this segment of the Proposed Project. Less than significant impacts to solid waste facilities would occur, and no mitigation is required (Class III).

Operational Impacts

No operational impacts related to socioeconomics were identified for the Alligator Rock–South of I-10 Frontage Alternative.

D.14.9 Alternatives for West of Devers

D.14.9.1 Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative

Environmental Setting

The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative (D–V Alternative) would be a new 500 kV line following the existing SCE Devers-Valley No. 1 500 kV transmission line corridor, located approximately two to three miles south of the DPV1 route. The D–V Alternative would be 41.3 miles long within the Cities of Palm Springs, Banning, and Beaumont, and the communities of Whitewater, Juniper Flats, and Romoland in unincorporated Riverside County. In addition, this alternative would travel through BLM and National Forest System land (the route would traverse a small portion of the San Bernardino National Forest and the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument) and would traverse large stretches of agricultural lands. Population, housing, employment, public services, and utilities data would be the same as described above for Section D.14.6.7, Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation, Section D.14.7.1, Devers Substation to East Border of Banning, and Section D.14.7.2, Banning and Beaumont.

Additionally, field reconnaissance performed by Aspen Environmental Group on February 22, 2006 identified the following utilities that would cross or run parallel to the alternative:

- Power distribution lines near Devers Substation, I-10, Ramona Expressway, Mapes Road, and Valley Substation
- Water and Southern California Gas Company gas pipelines in Cabazon Estates
- Colorado Aqueduct west of Cabazon Estates and at D–V Alternative MP 32.5
- 115 kV transmission lines near the Sun Lakes housing development in Beaumont.

Construction Impacts

Impact S-1: Accidents during project construction would disrupt utility systems (Class III)

Although the D–V Alternative would diverge substantially from the Proposed Project and would terminate in a different location, the types of utilities that would be potentially impacted by this alternative and the potential impacts to them would be similar to those for the Proposed Project. Compliance with California Government Code 4216-4216.9 would ensure that the potential impact related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

Impact S-2: Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class III)

Water. Water supplies for the D–V Alternative would be the same as described above for Section D.14.6.7, Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation, Section D.14.7.1, Devers Substation to East Border of Banning, and Section D.14.7.2, Banning and Beaumont, although the amount of water would be different. Based on the construction and water truck trip generation assumptions used in Section D.11, Air Quality, construction of this alternative is estimated to use approximately 5.3 af of water. The water required for this alternative would represent 0.0003 percent of the 1.7 million af available annually from MWD supplies in Riverside County. This minute fraction is not anticipated to place demands on the available water supply resulting in significant impacts or require the need for new or expanded water facilities. Consequently, water demands of this alternative would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required (Class III).

Solid Waste. Under this alternative, no transmission towers would be removed. Solid waste generated during construction of this alternative would be limited to construction debris and soil removed during grading and construction of tower footings. As identified in Tables D.14-6, Utility and Service Providers by Jurisdiction – Palo Verde Valley (Colorado River to Midpoint Substation) Segment and Table D.14-10, Demographic Characteristics – Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation Segment, this alternative is served by a variety of local landfills within Riverside County and the City of Palm Springs that would have the capacities to adequately handle solid waste generated during construction. Less than significant impacts to solid waste facilities would occur, and no mitigation is required (Class III).

Operational Impacts

Impact S-6: Project operation would provide revenue to the Morongo Band of Mission Indians (No Impact)

As opposed to the Proposed Project's West of Devers segment, the D–V Alternative would avoid lands owned by the Morongo Band of Mission Indians. Consequently, there would be no new revenue from ROW leases to the Morongo Band of Mission Indians associated with this project. While the D-V Alternative would eliminate the beneficial (Class IV) impact of the Proposed Project's West of Devers segment, the existing leases would still require renegotiation at the time of their expiration. Therefore, no revenue impacts to the Morongo Band would result from the construction of this alternative.

D.14.10 Environmental Impacts of the No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative is defined in Section C.6. The No Project Alternative includes the assumption that existing transmission lines and power plants would continue to operate. The effects that these facilities cause on the existing environment would not change, so no new impacts would occur from continuing operation of the existing transmission lines and power plants. Also, under the No Project Alternative, the proposed DPV2 project would not be constructed, so the impacts associated with construction and operation of the project would not occur. This would avoid adverse but less than significant utility system disruption impacts as well as impacts due to demands on water supplies and waste facilities.

The first component of the No Project Alternative is the continuation of ongoing demand-side actions, including energy conservation and distributed generation. These actions could result in adverse socioeconomic impacts to businesses attempting to accommodate the additional costs of shifting activities to off-peak periods or financing the purchase of DG technology. It is not expected that these actions would result in substantial impacts to utilities or service systems. As energy conservation and distributed generation would require no substantial construction, these activities would not require the use of any available construction workforce and would not require the use of any available housing units.

The second component of the No Project Alternative is the continuation of supply-side actions, resulting in potentially increased generation within California or increased transmission into California to serve anticipated growth in electricity consumption. The development of new power plants and new transmission lines would result in adverse impacts to water supplies and waste facilities and would potentially result in utility disruptions due to collocation accidents. Labor forces used in the construction of these projects would likely be drawn from the surrounding areas, so it is unlikely that adverse impacts to workforces or housing would occur, unless the projects required the removal of housing. Operation of new power plants and transmission lines could provide beneficial economic impacts through the provision of taxes and jobs to local economies. The resulting growth from these projects could also place demands on public service systems that would result in impacts to fire and police protection services. As discussed in Section F.2, Cumulative Impact Analysis, however, population growth in the areas these projects would be located in is expected to continue with or without the project, to which there would be no considerable contribution by the No Project Alternative.

D.14.11 Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Table

Table D.14-24 presents the mitigation monitoring table for Socioeconomics.

Table D.14-24. Mitigation Monitoring Program – Socioeconomics

IMPACT S-2	Project construction would place demands on local water or solid waste utilities (Class II)
MITIGATION MEASURE	S-2a: Recycle construction waste. To comply with the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, during project construction SCE and/or its construction contractor shall recycle a minimum of 50 percent of the waste generated during construction activities. Before the start of construction, SCE shall provide the CPUC/BLM with a letter explaining how it will comply with this requirement.
Location	West of Devers Proposed Project Segments
Monitoring / Reporting Action	CPUC/BLM shall monitor to verify that SCE provides the CPUC with documentation from the recycling and landfill facilities
Effectiveness Criteria	Recycle a minimum of 50 percent of the waste generated during construction activities
Responsible Agency	CPUC; BLM Palm Springs Field Office.
Timing	Project Construction

D.14.12 References

City of Blythe. 2006. Welcome to Blytheonline Community Portal. http://www.cityofblythe.com. Accessed February.

_____. 1989a. City of Blythe General Plan. September.

City of Banning. 2006. Welcome to Banning, CA. http://www.ci.banning.ca.us/default.asp?Page=1. Accessed February.

_____. 2005a. City of Banning Draft General Plan. September.

City of Beaumont. 2006. Welcome to the City of Beaumont. http://www.ci.beaumont.ca.us. Accessed February.

_____. 2000a. City of Beaumont General Plan. November 14.

City of Calimesa. 2006. City of Calimesa, CA. http://www.cityofcalimesa.net. Accessed February.

City of Cathedral City. 2006. City Information. http://www.cathedralcity.gov/Main/city_info.htm. Accessed February.

_____. 2002a. City of Cathedral City Comprehensive General Plan. March.

City of Coachella. 2006. Coachella. http://www.coachella.org. Accessed February.

City of Colton. 2006. Welcome to Colton. http://www.ci.colton.ca.us. Accessed February.

City of Desert Center. 2006. Desert Center, California (CA) Community Profile. http://www.hometownlocator.com/City/Desert-Center-California.cfm. Accessed February.

City of Desert Hot Springs. 2006. City of Desert Hot Springs, California. http://www.desert-hot-springs.us. Accessed February.

_____. 2000a. City of Desert Hot Springs Comprehensive General Plan. June.

City of Grand Terrace. 2006. Utility Services. http://www.cityofgrandterrace.org/city_services/utility.html. Accessed February.

City of Highland. 2006. Welcome to Highland California. http://www.ci.highland.ca.us. Accessed February.

City of Indio. 2006. City of Indio. http://www.indio.org. Accessed February.

_____. 1994a. City of Indio General Plan 2020. November.

City of Loma Linda. 2006. City of Loma Linda, California. http://www.lomalinda-ca.gov. Accessed February.

City of Moreno Valley. 2006. Moreno Valley. http://www.moreno-valley.ca.us. Accessed February.

City of Palm Desert. 2006. Welcome to Palm Desert California. http://www.palm-desert.org. Accessed February.

City of Palm Springs. 2006. Welcome to the City of Palm Springs. http://www.ci.palm-springs.ca.us. Accessed February.

City of Rancho Mirage. 2006. City of Rancho Mirage. http://www.ci.rancho-mirage.ca.us. Accessed February.

City of Redlands. 2006. Municipal Utilities Department. http://www.ci.redlands.ca.us/utilities. Accessed February.

City of Riverside. 2006. Riverside, California City Home. http://www.riversideca.gov. Accessed February.

City of San Bernardino. 2006. Welcome to the City of San Bernardino. http://www.ci.san-bernardino.ca.us. Accessed February.

City of San Bernardino Municipal Water Department. 2006. City of San Bernardino Municipal Water District. http://www.sbcitywater.org. Accessed February.

City of Yucaipa. 2006. City of Yucaipa, California. http://www.yucaipa.org. Accessed February.

Colorado River Indian Reservation. 2006. Colorado River Indian Reservation Community Profile. http://www.commerce.state.az.us/pdf/commasst/comm/colorver.pdf. Accessed February.

East Valley Water District. 2006. Year 2005 Available Water Data. http://www.eastvalley.org. Accessed February.

Eastern Municipal Water District. 2006. Year 2005 Available Water Data. http://www.emwd.org. Accessed February.

La Paz County. 2006. La Paz County http://www.co.la-paz.az.us. Accessed February.

_____. 2005a. La Paz County Comprehensive Plan. May.

Maricopa County. 2006. Maricopa.gov Arizona. http://www.maricopa.gov. Accessed February.

_____. 2002a. Maricopa County 2020 Comprehensive Plan. November.

Morongo Indian Nation. 2006. Morongo Band of Mission Indians. http://www.morongonation.org. Accessed February.

Riverside County Fire Department. 2006. Riverside County Fire Department. http://www.rvcfire.org/opencms/opencms/index.html. Accessed February.

Riverside County Sheriff's Department. 2006. Riverside County Sheriff's Department. http://www.riversidesheriff.org. Accessed February.

San Bernardino County. 2006. County of San Bernardino. http://www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us. Accessed February.

_____. 2002a. San Bernardino County General Plan. April.

San Bernardino County Fire Department. 2006. San Bernardino County Fire Department. http://www.sbcfire.org. Accessed February.

San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department. 2006. San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department. http://www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us/sheriff. Accessed February.

San Bernardino County Solid Waste Management Division. 2006. Department of Public Works Solid Waste Management Division. http://www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us/wsd. Accessed February.

Town of Buckeye. 2006. Town of Buckeye Arizona. http://www.buckeyeaz.gov. Accessed February.

Town of Quartzsite. 2006. Town of Quartzsite, Arizona Official Website. http://www.ci.quartzsite.az.us. Accessed February.

Unites States Census Bureau. 2000. U.S. Census Lookup Website. http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DatasetMainPageServlet?_program=DEC&_lang=en&_ts=. Accessed February 2, 2006.

Western Municipal Water District. 2006. Year 2005 Available Water Data. http://www.wmwd.com/index.htm. Accessed February.