D.13 Socioeconomics

This section addresses the environmental setting and impacts related to socioeconomics for the Proposed Project and alternatives. This analysis evaluates the potential for any short- and long-term project-induced population, housing, and/or employment impacts for areas adjacent to the proposed and alternative project corridors.

D.13.1 Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project

This section presents comprehensive baseline population, housing, and employment data. The study area for the project includes the Cities of Brisbane, Daly City, San Bruno, and South San Francisco, the Towns of Hillsborough and Colma, and the County of San Mateo. To examine labor force characteristics, it is assumed that most workers would make up to a one to two hour commute to the Proposed Project area. Counties within this one to two hour commute range include the nine counties in the San Francisco Bay Area region: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma Counties.

Demographic Characteristics

Table D.13-1 provides population information from the 1990 and 2000 Censuses for the study area.

Minority and Low-Income Populations. Table D.13-2 provides the total minority population and minority percentages for the State and the study area for the year 2000. It also provides information on populations living below the poverty level for the State and the study area for the year 2000.

Housing. Housing in the region includes single-family residences, apartments, condominiums, and mobile homes. Table D-13.3 presents housing data for the jurisdictions traversed by the Proposed Project route for the year 2000.

Table D.13-1. Study Area Populations and Growth Rates

City/County/Town	1990 Population	2000 Population	Percent Increase 1990–2000
County of San Mateo	649,623	707,161	8.9
Brisbane	2,942	3,597	22.2
Colma	1,103	1,191	8.0
Daly City	92,311	103,621	12.3
Hillsborough	10,667	10,825	1.5
San Bruno	38,961	40,165	3.1
South San Francisco	54,312	60,552	11.5

Source: US Census, 1990 and 2000.

Labor Force and Unemployment. Table D-13.4 provides employment data for the jurisdictions traversed by the Proposed Project and alternative routes for the year 2000. The majority of the labor force involved in construction of the Proposed Project and alternatives are listed in the California Employment Development Department's (EDD) labor force statistics as "Construction", and many of the workers fall into the "Specialty Trade Construction" work force under "Construction". Table D.13-5 provides the number of workers in the "Construction" and "Specialty Trade Construction" categories in February 2003 for the nine counties in the San Francisco Bay Area region. The Counties of Alameda and Contra Costa are grouped into the Oakland Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA); the Counties of San Francisco, Marin, and San Mateo are grouped into the San Francisco PMSA; and Solano and Napa Counties are grouped in the Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa PMSA.

Table D.13-2. Demographic Profile for the Project Study Area

City/County	Total Population	Total Minority Population (%)	Individuals Below Poverty Level (%)
State of California	33,871,648	18,054,858 (53.3%)	4,706,130 (13.9%)
County of San Mateo	707,161	354,806 (50.2%)	40,692 (5.8%)
Brisbane	3,597	1,268 (35.3%)	201 (5.6%)
Colma	1,191	861 (72.3%)	58 (4.9%)
Daly City	103,621	85,277 (82.3%)	7,265 (7.0%)
Hillsborough	10,825	3,284 (30.3%)	299 (2.8%)
San Bruno	40,165	21,343 (53.1%)	1,774 (4.4%)
South San Francisco	60,552	42,065 (69.5%)	3,151 (5.2%)

Source: US Census, 2000.

Table D.13-3. San Mateo County Housing Data

Jurisdiction	Total Units	Vacant	Vacancy Rate (%)
County of San Mateo	260,576	6,473	2.5%
Brisbane	1,831	211	11.5%
Colma	342	13	3.8%
Daly City	30,775	536	1.7%
Hillsborough	3,804	115	3.0%
San Bruno	14,980	303	2.0%
South San Francisco	20,138	461	2.3%

Source: US Census, 2000.

Table D.13-4. San Mateo County Employment Data

Jurisdiction	Total Labor Force	Total Unemployed	Unemployment Rate (%)
County of San Mateo	373,911	12,191	2.2%
Brisbane	2,216	119	4.0%
Colma	534	17	1.8%
Daly City	52,914	2,008	2.4%
Hillsborough	4,699	59	0.7%
San Bruno	21,964	600	1.9%
South San Francisco	30,988	1,185	2.5%

Source: US Census, 2000.

Table D.13-5. Construction Labor Force Data for the San Francisco Bay Area Region

Jurisdiction/PMSA	Total Labor Force	Construction Labor Force	Specialty Trade Construction Labor Force
Oakland PMSA	1,303,700	63,100	38,300
San Francisco PMSA	930,600	42,800	23,200
Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa PMSA	284,200	15,800	9,900
Santa Clara County	932,700	38,700	27,400
Sonoma County	266,400	12,900	7,900

Source: EDD, 2003.

D.13.2 Applicable Regulations, Plans, and Standards

The following section presents the State, regional, and local environmental justice regulations, plans, and standards that pertain to the Proposed Project and alternatives. There are no federal regulations, plans, or standards related to socioeconomics that are directly applicable to the Proposed Project and alternatives.

D.13.2.1 State

Under CEQA, California Code of Regulation 14, Section 15131 states the following:

- Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment.
- Economic or social factors of a project may be used to determine the significance of physical changes caused by the project.
- 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 and or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

D.13.2.2 Regional and Local

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) developed "A Land Use Policy Framework for the San Francisco Bay Area" in July 1990, to establish a guidance framework for regional comprehensive planning. ABAG includes the governments of the nine counties in the Bay Area, described above in Section D.13.1, and 99 of the 101 cities in the Bay Area. The policies in the framework encourage efficient use of existing land uses and infrastructure, subregional coordination on items of regional importance, and actions and programs which improve revenue generation and cost sharing. The following policy is applicable to the Proposed Project and alternatives:

- **Policy Four** – Provision of housing opportunities for all income levels are encouraged by developing city and county plans and policies that improve housing supply and affordability to meet local and regional needs.

D.13.3 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

D.13.3.1 Significance Criteria

Socioeconomic impacts potentially resulting from project construction and project operation would occur under the following conditions:

- If the Proposed Project or alternatives would induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes or businesses), or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure);
- If the Proposed Project or alternatives would create a significant demand for labor; or
- If the Proposed Project or alternatives would displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

D.13.3.2 Applicant Proposed Measures

The Applicant did not propose any measures to reduce any potential project-related socioeconomic impacts.

D.13.3.3 230 kV/60 kV Overhead Transmission Line

Project-Related Population Growth

The Proposed Project is designed to increase system reliability and facilitate the possible retirement of power plants currently serving San Francisco. As the project would be accommodating existing power demands in the City of San Francisco rather than facilitating future expansion, it is not expected that the project would increase regional population. Therefore, there would be no population growth related impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

Impact S-1: Induce Demand for Labor

Approximately 14.7 miles of overhead transmission line would be installed from Jefferson Substation to the new transition station. The length of time required for construction of the overhead segment of the Proposed Project is approximately 13 months and would require 24 separate construction crews, each crew ranging from 4 to 12 crew members, for a total of between 100 to 200 crew members.

It is expected that workers required for project construction would be from the local Bay Area labor force. Tables D.13-4 and D.13-5 show a strong labor force with a range of unemployment rates, and a sizable construction labor force. As such, there is an adequate available labor force within daily commuting distance to supply the work force for the project. Impacts would be less than significant (Class III) and mitigation measures are not required

Impact S-2: Displacement of People or Existing Housing

Because few, if any, workers are expected to relocate to the area, no new housing would be needed for the project, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would likely occur. Temporary accommodations may be needed during construction, but with numerous hotels and motels in the area, impacts are expected to be less than significant (Class III) and mitigation measures are not required.

D.13.3.4 230 kV Underground Transmission Line

As previously described in Section D.13.3.3, because the project would be accommodating existing power demands in the City of San Francisco rather than facilitating future expansion, it is not expected that the project would induce growth in the region. Therefore, there would be no population growth related impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

Approximately 13 miles of underground 230 kV single-circuit transmission line would be installed from the transition station to the Martin Substation. The length of time required for construction of the underground segment of the Proposed Project is approximately 12 months and would require an estimated 15 separate construction crews, each crew ranging from 4 to 22 crew members, for a total of between 150 to 250 crew members.

As discussed in Section D.13.3.3, the Applicant is expected to utilize the local Bay Area labor force which would be more than adequate to supply workers for the project. Therefore, impacts associated with induced labor demand (Impact S-1) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and would not require mitigation measures.

With the available labor force in the Bay Area region, few, if any, workers are expected to relocate to the area, no new housing would be needed for the project, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Some need for temporary accommodations would likely arise at times during construction, but with numerous hotels and motels in the area, impacts associated with displacement of people or existing housing (Impact S-2) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and mitigation measures would not be required.

D.13.3.5 Transition Station, Substations, Switchyards, and Taps

Operation of the transition station, modified substations, switchyards, and taps would not require any additional workers for operations or maintenance. As such, no people or housing would be displaced, no additional competition for existing housing would result from the project, and no new regional growth is expected as a direct or indirect result of the project.

A transition station is needed to convert the overhead circuit to underground, the modifications of the Jefferson, Martin, Ralston, Carolands, Monta Vista, Millbrae, and San Mateo substations and the Hillsdale Junction Switchyard are needed to accommodate the new features of the project, and the 60 kV connection taps are necessary to accommodate the Proposed Project. Construction of the transition station would take only a few months and would require less than 50 workers. Modification to the substations, switchyard, and taps would be made to existing infrastructure and would require relatively few workers.

As discussed in Section D.13.3.3, the Applicant is expected to utilize the local Bay Area labor force, which would be more than adequate to supply workers for the project. Impacts on labor demand (Impact S-1) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and mitigation measures are not required.

With the available labor force in the Bay Area region, few, if any, workers would be expected to relocate to the area, no new housing would be needed for the project, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Some need for temporary accommodations would likely arise at times during construction, but with numerous hotels and motels in the area, any impacts associated with displacement of people of existing housing (Impact S-2) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and mitigation measures are not required.

D.13.4 Southern Area Alternatives

D.13.4.1 PG&E Route Option 1B – Underground

This alternative is an underground option to the first 11.2 miles of the southern overhead segment of the Proposed Project along the Interstate 280 (I-280) corridor. This alternative was suggested by PG&E in its PEA as Route Option 1B and was endorsed during the scoping process by numerous agencies and individuals, including the residents of the Town of Hillsborough and the San Mateo Highlands.

Environmental Setting

The study area for this alternative is largely the same as for the Proposed Project, although it would also include the Cities of Burlingame and Millbrae in addition to passing through Hillsborough, San Bruno, and County of San Mateo lands in the southern part of the route. Labor force characteristics are drawn from the same nine-county San Francisco Bay Area region used for the Proposed Project and shown in Table D.13-5.

Table D.13-6. Cities of Burlingame and Millbrae – Population and Growth Rates

City	1990 Population	2000 Population	Percent Increase 1990–2000
Burlingame	26,801	28,158	5.1
Millbrae	20,412	20,718	1.5

Source: US Census, 1990 and 2000.

Table D.13-7. Cities of Burlingame and Millbrae – Demographic Profiles

City	Total Population	Total Minority Population	Individuals Below Poverty Level
Burlingame	28,158	8,095 (28.8%)	1,570 (5.7%)
Millbrae	20,718	8,504 (41.0%)	693 (3.4%)

Source: US Census, 2000.

Table D.13-8. Cities of Burlingame and Millbrae – Housing Data

City	Total Units	Vacant	Vacancy Rate
Burlingame	12,869	358	2.8%
Millbrae	8,113	157	1.9%

Source: US Census, 2000.

Table D.13-9. Cities of Burlingame and Millbrae – Employment Data

City	Total Labor Force	Total Unemployed	Unemployment Rate
Burlingame	15,729	344	1.5%
Millbrae	9,827	176	1.0%

Source: US Census, 2000.

Demographic Characteristics

Table D.13-6 summarizes the population and growth rates according to the 1990 and 2000 Census for the Cities of Burlingame and Millbrae. Table D.13-1 above provides population and growth rates for the other parts of the study area.

Minority and Low-Income Populations. Table D.13-7 provides the total minority population, minority percentages, and total population of individuals below the poverty line for the Cities of Burlingame and Millbrae. Table D.13-2 above provides minority and poverty data for the State, the County of San Mateo, and other cities and towns in the study area for the year 2000.

Housing. Housing in the region includes single-family residences, apartments, condominiums, and mobile homes. Table D.13-8 presents housing data for the Cities of Burlingame and Millbrae. Table D.13-3 above provides housing information for the rest of the study area for the year 2000.

Labor Force and Unemployment. Table D.13-9 provides employment data for the Cities of Burlingame and Millbrae, while Table D.13-4 presents employment data for the other jurisdictions traversed by the alternative route. The labor force for this alternative would be drawn from the same pool as the Proposed Project. Table D.13-5 provides the number of workers in the "Construction" and "Specialty Trade Construction" categories in February 2003, for the nine counties in the San Francisco Bay Area region.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

No people or housing would be displaced, no additional competition for existing housing would result from the project, and no new regional growth would be expected as a direct or indirect result of the project. There would be no impact associated with project-related population growth.

Due to construction of the trench necessary for this alternative and the required maintenance activities in two transmission easements instead of one, PG&E Route Option 1B would require more temporary workers for construction of the alternative and could require additional personnel to monitor and maintain the new transmission easement. Assuming that the level of effort to install this underground alternative is similar to that which would be required to install the underground portion of the Proposed

Project, this alternative could require between 150 and 250 crew members. Few, if any, additional personnel would be necessary for operation and maintenance of a new easement.

As described above in Section D.13.3.3, 230/60 kV Overhead Transmission Line, the Applicant is expected to utilize the local Bay Area labor force to the greatest extent possible. No new housing would be required needed for the alternative, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Some need for temporary accommodations could arise, but with adequate temporary housing in the area, impacts would be less than significant. Impacts S-1 (induced labor demand) and S-2 (displacement of people or existing housing) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and mitigation measures are not required.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

While PG&E Route Option 1B would utilize more temporary labor than the proposed route segment, in the larger context of the San Francisco Bay Area construction and specialist trade construction labor force, there would be little difference between this alternative and proposed route segment. Similarly, maintenance of a second transmission easement could require additional permanent personnel, compared to no need for additional personnel associated with the Proposed Project, but it is unlikely that this would require any new permanent employees, which in the context of the Bay Area's labor force is a negligible difference. Therefore, there is little difference between the Proposed Project and this alternative.

D.13.4.2 Partial Underground Alternative

Environmental Setting

Section D.13.1 describes the study area and environmental setting for this alternative as well as for the Proposed Project.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This alternative would be approximately one mile longer than the Proposed Project segment and would require additional construction due to trenching for the underground portions in the southern parts of this route. Assuming that the level of effort to install this underground alternative is similar to that which would be required to install the underground portion of the Proposed Project, this alternative could require between 150 and 250 crew members. While additional crew members would be necessary for construction of the route, as the Partial Underground alternative follows an existing easement alignment, no new personnel would be necessary to operate or maintain the route.

As with PG&E Route Option, no population growth would occur, no new housing would be needed for this alternative, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Need for temporary accommodations could occur during construction, but any impacts would be less than significant. There would be no impacts associated with population growth and Impacts S-1 (induced labor demand) and S-2 (displacement of people or existing housing) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation measures would be required.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

The Partial Underground Alternative would utilize more temporary labor than the applicable portion of the Proposed Project. In the larger context of the San Francisco Bay Area construction and specialist trade construction labor force; however, there would be little difference between the alternative and proposed route segment.

D.13.5 Northern Area Alternatives

D.13.5.1 West of Skyline Transition Station

This alternative transition station would be located west of Skyline Boulevard, across the street and southeast of the proposed transition station location at the intersection of Skyline Boulevard and San Bruno Avenue. This transition station could be used with three possible underground transmission line routes: the Proposed Project route along San Bruno Avenue, along Sneath Lane to the BART ROW, or along Westborough Boulevard to the BART ROW.

Environmental Setting of the Alternative Transition Station

The West of Skyline Transition Station would be located on SFPUC Peninsula Watershed Lands, but the socioeconomic impacts of the project with this transition station would affect the entire study area as described in Section D.13.1, including the Cities of Brisbane, Daly City, San Bruno, and South San Francisco, the Towns of Hillsborough and Colma, and the County of San Mateo. Tables D.13-1 through D.13-5 provide population, housing, income, demographic, and labor statistics for the study area.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Alternative Transition Station

As construction of the West of Skyline Transition Station would be similar in size and nature to the proposed transition station, the environmental impacts associated with its construction would be the same as those associated with construction impacts of the Proposed Project. Construction of the transition station would take only a few months and would require less than 50 workers. No new permanent personnel would be necessary to maintain or operate the station.

The Applicant is expected to utilize the local Bay Area labor force, which would be more than adequate to supply workers for the project. Impacts on labor demand (Impact S-1) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and mitigation measures are not required.

With the available labor force in the Bay Area region, few, if any, workers would be expected to relocate to the area, no new housing would be needed for the project, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Some need for temporary accommodations would likely arise at times during construction, but with numerous hotels and motels in the area, any impacts associated with displacement of people of existing housing (Impact S-2) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and mitigation measures are not required.

Comparison to Proposed Transition Station

Socioeconomic impacts of the West of Skyline Transition Station would be no different from any impacts resulting from construction or operation of the proposed transition station.

West of Skyline Transition Station with Proposed Underground Route

This alternative would run from a transition station west of Skyline Boulevard and travel north underground on Skyline Boulevard for 0.1 miles, turning east at San Bruno Avenue to join the Proposed Project route.

Environmental Setting

The proposed underground route extending from the West of Skyline Transition Station would cross through San Bruno. As with the West of Skyline Transition Station, however, the socioeconomic effects of the project would affect the entire study area as described in Section D.13.1. Tables D.13-1 through D.13-5 provide population, housing, income, demographic, and labor statistics for the study area.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This alternative would be slightly longer than the proposed route segment, requiring additional construction due to extended trenching for the route, and as such would require more temporary workers for construction.

As described above in Section D.13.3.4, 230 kV Underground Transmission Line, the Applicant is expected to utilize the local Bay Area labor force to the greatest extent possible. Although more workers would be required for construction of this alternative, it is expected that they would be drawn from the San Francisco Bay Area labor force. No new housing would be required needed for the alternative, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Some need for temporary accommodations could arise, but with hotels and motels in the area, any impacts would be less than significant.

As such, no population growth would occur, no people or housing would be displaced, no additional competition for existing housing would result from the project, and no new regional growth would be expected as a direct or indirect result of the project. There would be no impacts associated with population growth and Impacts S-1 (induced labor demand) and S-2 (displacement of people or existing housing) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation measures would be required.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

This alternative would utilize slightly more temporary labor than the Proposed Project segment, but in the larger context of the San Francisco Bay Area construction and specialist trade construction labor force, there would be little difference between this alternative and the proposed route segment.

West of Skyline Transition Station with Sneath Lane Underground Route

This alternative would run from a transition station west of Skyline Boulevard and would travel north underground on Skyline Boulevard for 0.6 miles, turning east onto Sneath Lane to join the Proposed Project route in the BART ROW.

Environmental Setting

The Sneath Lane underground route extending from the West of Skyline Transition Station would cross through San Bruno. As with the West of Skyline Transition Station, however, the socioeconomic effects of the project would affect the entire study area as described in Section D.13.1. Tables D.13-1 through D.13-5 provide population, housing, income, demographic, and labor statistics for the study area.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

As described for the West of Skyline Transition Station with Proposed Underground Route, this alternative would be slightly longer than the Proposed Project segment. The alternative would require additional construction due to more trenching for the route, and would require more temporary workers for construction.

As described above in Section D.13.3.4, 230 kV Underground Transmission Line, the Applicant is expected to utilize the local Bay Area labor force to the greatest extent possible. Although more workers would be required for construction of this alternative, it is expected that they would be drawn from the San Francisco Bay Area labor force. No new housing would be required for this alternative, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Some need for temporary accommodations could arise, but with hotels and motels in the area, any impacts would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation measures are required.

No population growth would occur, no people or housing would be displaced, no additional competition for existing housing would result from the project, and no new regional growth would be expected as a direct or indirect result of the project. There would be no impacts associated with population growth and Impacts S-1 (induced labor demand) and S-2 (displacement of people or existing housing) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation measures are required.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

This alternative would utilize slightly more temporary labor than the Proposed Project segment, but in the larger context of the San Francisco Bay Area construction and specialist trade construction labor force, there would be little difference between this alternative and the Proposed Project segment.

West of Skyline Transition Station with Westborough Boulevard Underground

This alternative would run from a transition station west of Skyline Boulevard and would travel north underground on Skyline Boulevard for 2.1 miles, turning east onto Westborough Boulevard to join the Proposed Project route in the BART ROW.

Environmental Setting

Although the Westborough Boulevard Underground route would extend from the West of Skyline Transition Station and cross through San Bruno and South San Francisco, the socioeconomic effects of the project would affect the entire study area as described in Section D.13.1. Tables D.13-1 through D.13-5 provide population, housing, income, demographic, and labor statistics for the study area.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

As described for the two previous West of Skyline Transition Station underground routes, this alternative would be slightly longer than the Proposed Project segment, adding an additional 2.1 miles of trenching to the project. The alternative would require additional construction due to more trenching for the route, and would require more temporary workers for construction.

As described above in Section D.13.3.4, 230 kV Underground Transmission Line, the Applicant is expected to utilize the local Bay Area labor force to the greatest extent possible. Although more workers would be required for construction of this alternative, it is expected that they would be drawn from the San Francisco Bay Area labor force.

No new housing would be required needed for the alternative, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Some need for temporary accommodations could arise, but with hotels and motels in the area, any impacts would be less than significant.

No population growth would occur, no people or housing would be displaced, no additional competition for existing housing would result from the project, and no new regional growth would be expected as a direct

or indirect result of the project. There would be no impacts associated with population growth and Impacts S-1 (induced labor demand) and S-2 (displacement of people or existing housing) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation measures would be required.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

This alternative would utilize slightly more temporary labor than the proposed route segment, but in the larger context of the San Francisco Bay Area construction and specialist trade construction labor force, there would be little difference between this alternative and the proposed route segment.

D.13.5.2 Sneath Lane Transition Station

The Sneath Lane transition station requires that the new overhead 60/230 kV line would extend north-northwest along Skyline Boulevard for 0.6 additional miles past San Bruno Avenue to near the Sneath Lane Substation. A transition station would be installed adjacent to the existing substation and an underground route to the Martin Substation would originate from this point. Like the West of Skyline transition station, the Sneath Lane transition station could be used with three possible underground transmission line routes: the Proposed Project route along San Bruno Avenue, along Sneath Lane to the BART ROW, or along Westborough Boulevard to the BART ROW.

Environmental Setting of the Transition Station Alternative

The Sneath Lane Transition Station would be located in San Bruno, but the socioeconomic effects of the project with this transition station alternative would affect the entire study area as described in Section D.13.1, including the Cities of Brisbane, Daly City, San Bruno, and South San Francisco, the Towns of Hillsborough and Colma, and the County of San Mateo. Tables D.13-1 through D.13-5 provide population, housing, income, demographic, and labor statistics for the study area.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Construction of the Sneath Lane Transition Station would be similar in size and nature to the proposed transition station. The environmental impacts associated with its construction would be the same as those associated with construction impacts of the Proposed Project. Construction of the transition station would take only a few months and would require less than 50 workers. No new permanent personnel would be necessary to maintain or operate the station.

The Applicant is expected to utilize the local Bay Area labor force, which would be more than adequate to supply workers for the project. Impacts on labor demand (Impact S-1) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and mitigation measures are not required.

With the available labor force in the Bay Area region, few, if any, workers would be expected to relocate to the area, no new housing would be needed for the project, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Some need for temporary accommodations would likely arise at times during construction, but with numerous hotels and motels in the area, any impacts associated with displacement of people of existing housing (Impact S-2) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and mitigation measures are not required.

Comparison to Proposed Transition Station

Socioeconomic impacts of the Sneath Lane Transition Station would be no different from any impacts resulting from construction or operation of the proposed transition station.

Sneath Lane Transition Station with Proposed Underground Route

The line from a transition station adjacent to the Sneath Lane Substation would travel south underground on Skyline Boulevard for 0.5 miles, turning east at San Bruno Avenue to join the Proposed Project route.

Environmental Setting

The Proposed Underground route extending from the Sneath Lane Transition Station would cross through San Bruno, but the socioeconomic impacts of the project would affect the entire study area as described in Section D.13.1. Tables D.13-1 through D.13-5 provide population, housing, income, demographic, and labor statistics for the study area.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

As described for the West of Skyline Transition Station with Sneath Lane Underground Route, this alternative would be slightly longer than the Proposed Project segment, as the route would include an additional distance along Skyline Boulevard between Sneath Lane and San Bruno Avenue. The alternative would require additional construction due to more trenching for the route, and would require more temporary workers for construction.

As described above in Section D.13.3.4, 230 kV Underground Transmission Line, the Applicant is expected to utilize the local Bay Area labor force to the greatest extent possible. Although more workers would be required for construction of this alternative, it is expected that they would be drawn from the San Francisco Bay Area labor force. No new housing would be required for this alternative, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Some need for temporary accommodations could arise, but with hotels and motels in the area, any impacts would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation measures are required.

No population growth would occur, no people or housing would be displaced, no additional competition for existing housing would result from the project, and no new regional growth would be expected as a direct or indirect result of the project. There would be no impacts associated with population growth and Impacts S-1 (induced labor demand) and S-2 (displacement of people or existing housing) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation measures are required.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

Socioeconomic impacts of the Sneath Lane transition station with Proposed Underground Route would be no different from any impacts resulting from construction or operation of the Proposed Project underground route segment.

Sneath Lane Transition Station with Sneath Lane Underground Route

The line from a transition station adjacent to the Sneath Lane Substation would travel east underground along Sneath Lane to join the Proposed Project route at the BART ROW.

Environmental Setting

The Sneath Lane Underground route extending from the Sneath Lane Transition Station would cross through San Bruno, but the socioeconomic effects of the project would affect the entire study area as described in Section D.13.1. Tables D.13-1 through D.13-5 provide population, housing, income, demographic, and labor statistics for the study area.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This alternative would be roughly the same length as the proposed route segment. As described above in Section D.13.3.4, 230 kV Underground Transmission Line, the Applicant is expected to utilize the local Bay Area labor force to the greatest extent possible. No new housing would be required needed for the alternative, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Some need for temporary accommodations could arise, but with hotels and motels in the area, any impacts would be less than significant.

As such, no population growth would occur, no people or housing would be displaced, no additional competition for existing housing would result from the project, and no new regional growth would be expected as a direct or indirect result of the project. There would be no impacts associated with population growth and Impacts S-1 (induced labor demand) and S-2 (displacement of people or existing housing) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation measures would be required.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

As discussed for the West Skyline Transition Station with Sneath Lane Underground Route, socioeconomic impacts of this alternative would be no different from any impacts resulting from construction or operation of the Proposed Project underground route segment.

Sneath Lane Transition Station with Westborough Boulevard Underground

The line from a transition station adjacent to the Sneath Lane Substation would travel north underground on Skyline Boulevard for 1.6 miles, turning east onto Westborough Boulevard to join the Proposed Project route in the BART ROW.

Environmental Setting

Although the Westborough Boulevard Underground route would extend from the Sneath Lane Transition Station and cross through the Cities of San Bruno and South San Francisco, the socioeconomic impacts of the project would affect the entire study area as described in Section D.13.1. Tables D.13-1 through D.13-5 provide population, housing, income, demographic, and labor statistics for the study area.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This alternative would be slightly longer than the Proposed Project segment, adding an additional 1.6 miles of trenching to the project. The alternative would require additional construction due to more trenching for the route, and would require more temporary workers for construction.

As described above in Section D.13.3.4, 230 kV Underground Transmission Line, the Applicant is expected to utilize the local Bay Area labor force to the greatest extent possible. Although more workers would be required for construction of this alternative, it is expected that they would be drawn from the San Francisco Bay Area labor force.

No new housing would be required needed for the alternative, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Some need for temporary accommodations could arise, but with hotels and motels in the area, any impacts would be less than significant.

No population growth would occur, no people or housing would be displaced, no additional competition for existing housing would result from the project, and no new regional growth would be expected as a direct or indirect result of the project. There would be no impacts associated with population growth and Impacts S-1 (induced labor demand) and S-2 (displacement of people or existing housing) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation measures would be required.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

This alternative would utilize slightly more temporary labor than the Proposed Project segment, but in the larger context of the San Francisco Bay Area construction and specialist trade construction labor force, there would be little difference between this alternative and the Proposed Project segment.

D.13.5.3 Cherry Avenue Alternative

This alternative route would diverge from the Proposed Project route at the intersection of San Bruno Avenue and Cherry Avenue. It would follow Cherry Avenue for 0.5 miles to the north to Sneath Lane, where it would turn east to El Camino Real or Huntington Avenue near the BART ROW.

Environmental Setting

The Cherry Avenue Alternative route is entirely within the City of San Bruno, but the socioeconomic effects of the project would affect the entire study area as described in Section D.13.1. Tables D.13-1 through D.13-5 provide population, housing, income, demographic, and labor statistics for the study area.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This alternative would be roughly the same length as the proposed route segment. As described above in Section D.13.3.4, 230 kV Underground Transmission Line, the Applicant is expected to utilize the local Bay Area labor force to the greatest extent possible. No new housing would be required needed for the alternative, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Some need for temporary accommodations could arise, but with hotels and motels in the area, any impacts would be less than significant.

As such, no population growth would occur, no people or housing would be displaced, no additional competition for existing housing would result from the project, and no new regional growth would be expected as a direct or indirect result of the project. There would be no impacts associated with population growth and Impacts S-1 (induced labor demand) and S-2 (displacement of people or existing housing) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation measures would be required.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

Socioeconomic impacts of the Cherry Avenue Alternative route would be no different from any impacts resulting from construction or operation of the Proposed Project underground route segment.

D.13.5.4 PG&E's Route Option 4B – East Market Street

This alternative would diverge from the Proposed Project route by continuing north on Hillside (where the Proposed Project turns east onto Hoffman). The route would follow Hillside for 0.4 miles, and then turn northeast into East Market Street, where it would rejoin the Proposed Project route at Orange Street. This alternative is a total of approximately 0.6 miles and would replace 0.8 miles of the Proposed Project route.

Environmental Setting

PG&E's Route Option 4B – East Market Street route would cross through the Town of Colma, but the socio-economic effects of the project would affect the entire study area as described in Section D.13.1. Tables D.13-1 through D.13-5 provide population, housing, income, demographic, and labor statistics for the study area.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

As PG&E's Route Option 4B would be slightly shorter than the Proposed Project route, impacts would be similar, but slightly less. The difference of 0.2 miles in construction distance would likely be a negligible difference in the amount of construction labor necessary for the project. The Applicant is expected to utilize the local Bay Area labor force to the greatest extent possible. No new housing would be required needed for the alternative, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Some need for temporary accommodations could arise, but with hotels and motels in the area, any impacts would be less than significant.

As such, no population growth would occur, no people or housing would be displaced, no additional competition for existing housing would result from the project, and no new regional growth would be expected as a direct or indirect result of the project. There would be no impacts associated with population growth and Impacts S-1 (induced labor demand) and S-2 (displacement of people or existing housing) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation measures would be required.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

Differences in the socioeconomic impacts of PG&E's Route Option 4B – East Market Street alternative would be minimal compared with any impacts resulting from construction or operation of the Proposed Project underground route segment.

D.13.5.5 Junipero Serra Alternative

This alternative would diverge from either of the Westborough Boulevard route alternatives at the intersection of Junipero Serra and Westborough Boulevard. The route would follow Junipero Serra underground for 1.8 miles. The route would turn east into Serramonte Boulevard, for approximately one mile to Hillside, where it would rejoin the Proposed Project route. This alternative would replace a similar distance of the Proposed Project.

Environmental Setting

The Junipero Serra Alternative would cross through the Cities of South San Francisco and Colma, but the socioeconomic effects of the project would affect the entire study area as described in Section D.13.1. Tables D.13-1 through D.13-5 provide population, housing, income, demographic, and labor statistics for the study area.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This alternative would be roughly the same length as the proposed route segment. The Applicant is expected to utilize the local Bay Area labor force to the greatest extent possible. No new housing would be required needed for the alternative, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Some need for temporary accommodations could arise, but with hotels and motels in the area, any impacts would be less than significant.

As such, no population growth would occur, no people or housing would be displaced, no additional competition for existing housing would result from the project, and no new regional growth would be expected as a direct or indirect result of the project. There would be no impacts associated with population growth and Impacts S-1 (induced labor demand) and S-2 (displacement of people or existing housing) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation measures would be required.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

Socioeconomic impacts of the Junipero Serra Boulevard Alternative route would be no different from any impacts resulting from construction or operation of the Proposed Project underground route segment.

D.13.5.6 Modified Existing 230 kV Underground ROW

This alternative is an underground alternative to the northern underground segment of the Proposed Project between the intersection of Millbrae Avenue and El Camino Real and the intersection of Guadalupe Canyon Parkway and Bayshore Boulevard. This alternative would use a portion of the existing underground 230 kV transmission line through the Cities of Millbrae, San Bruno, and Brisbane, and would incorporate a new route segment through South San Francisco and adjacent cities. For the majority of this alternative's alignment, the route would be significantly different from the proposed underground route.

Environmental Setting

The study area for this alternative is largely the same as for the Proposed Project, passing through San Bruno, South San Francisco, and Brisbane. Refer to Section D.13.1 for data for the cities along this alternative route.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This alternative would be substantially shorter than the proposed underground route segment. The Applicant is expected to utilize the local Bay Area labor force to the greatest extent possible. No new housing would be required needed for the alternative, no housing would be displaced, and no new competition for existing housing would be likely to occur. Some need for temporary accommodations could arise, but with hotels and motels in the area, any impacts would be less than significant.

As such, no population growth would occur, no people or housing would be displaced, no additional competition for existing housing would result from the project, and no new regional growth would be expected as a direct or indirect result of the project. There would be no impacts associated with population growth and Impacts S-1 (induced labor demand) and S-2 (displacement of people or existing housing) would be adverse, but less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation measures would be required.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

While this alternative would be substantially shorter than the underground segment of the Proposed Project, socioeconomic impacts of the Modified Existing 230 kV Underground ROW alternative would not differ from the impacts resulting from construction or operation of the Proposed Project underground route segment.

D.13.6 Environmental Impacts of the No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, it is assumed that certain other transmission and substation upgrades would be made, and that the CCSF would install the four turbine generators it has been given. These projects would require construction, potentially adding to the area's workforce for short periods of time. However, the No Project Alternative, described in Section C.6, would result in no population growth. As discussed under Cumulative Impacts, population growth in the area is expected to continue with or without the project, but the No Project Alternative's contribution to this would be less than significant (Class III). Impacts to labor and housing as a result of the No Project Alternative would also be less than significant (Class III).

D.13.7 Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Table

Neither the Proposed Project nor any alternatives would result in impacts requiring mitigation. No mitigation monitoring table is required.