# E.4.14 Socioeconomics

## E.4.14.1 Environmental Setting

The Modified Route D Alternative route is described in Section E.4.1. It includes three main segments: a southwesterly segment that crosses BLM, CNF and private lands before reaching the Cameron Substation, a westerly segment that follows the southern boundary of the CNF, and a northerly segment that is primarily on CNF land and includes the Modified Route D Substation.

Jurisdictions along this alternative route include U.S. Forest Service, County of San Diego, and City of San Diego. Land uses along this alternative route would include grazing operations, Cleveland National Forest, open space, and rural residential. Land use classifications include agriculture, parks and recreation, and residential. Demographics, housing, and public services and utilities providers' information would be the same as the Proposed Project in San Diego County, which is described in Section D.14.2. Information on the town of Alpine is listed under the Interstate 8 Alternative in Section D.14.12.

Significance criteria for the Modified Route D Alternative are the same as for the Proposed Project (see Section D.14).

## E.4.14.2 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table E.4.14-1 summarizes the impacts of the Modified Route D Alternative on Socioeconomics

Table E.4.14-1. Impacts Identified – Modified Route D Alternative – Socioeconomics

| Impact No. | Description | Impact Significance |
|---|---|---|
| Modified Route D Alternative ~~and~~ with or without Star Valley Option and PCT Reroute Option C/D | | |
| S-1 | Project construction and/or transmission line presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses, tribes, or governments | Class II, III, IV |
| S-2 | Construction would disrupt the existing utility systems or cause a collocation accident | Class II, III |
| S-3 | Project construction and operation would increase the need for public services and facilities | Class III |
| S-4 | Property tax revenues from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Class IV |
| S-5 | Presence of the project would decrease property values | Class III |
| Modified Route D Alternative Substation | | |
| S-2 | Construction would disrupt the existing utility systems or cause a collocation accident | Class II |
| S-3 | Project construction and operation would increase the need for public services and facilities | Class III |
| S-4 | Property tax revenues from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies | Class IV |
| S-5 | Presence of the project would decrease property values | Class III |

## Construction Impacts

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

**Revenue from Business Operations.** Business uses occur along the Modified Route D route, but the project would not require the removal or relocation of any business uses. Impacts on local businesses would result from degradation of views, views of construction equipment and activity, vehicular or pedestrian access restrictions, land use, air quality, and noise effects, or health and safety concerns (such as EMF). These issues are analyzed in this document in Sections E.4.3 (Visual Resources), E.4.4 (Land Use), E.4.8 (Noise), E.4.9 (Traffic/Transportation), and E.4.10 (Public Health and Safety). Where impacts for these issue areas are found to be less than significant or have been mitigated to less than significant levels, any associated loss of local business revenue impacts would not be significant. In addition, because these impacts would be short-term construction impacts and no removal of businesses would be required, these impacts would not result in significant revenue impacts (Class III). Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are recommended outside of those presented in Sections E.4.3 (Visual Resources), E.4.9 (Traffic/Transportation), E.4.4 (Land Use), and E.4.10 (Public Health and Safety) to mitigate potential impacts that would result in a substantial change to local business revenues. (See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.)

**Revenue from Agricultural Operations.** Construction in agricultural areas of the Modified Route D Alternative would require construction equipment to traverse agricultural land. This would temporarily restrict crop production or damage crops if activities occurred during the growing season. The restriction of crop production or damage to crops would decrease revenues for the agricultural landowners whose crops would be affected by project activities (Class II). As discussed in Section E.4.6 (Agricultural Resources), land under active agricultural operation would be temporarily and permanently impacted by the project. This would involve the construction and/or expansion of access roads, the installation of tower structures and wires, and the presence/staging of construction equipment and vehicles.

Since impacts to Active Agricultural Operations would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of land use and agricultural resources APMs and mitigation measures, and/or farmers would be compensated for project-related losses of crops or other pertinent agricultural resources based upon a professional appraisal (APM LU-3), any associated impacts to crop and/or grazing revenues would be less than significant. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are recommended outside of those presented in Section E.4.6 (Agricultural Resources) to mitigate potential impacts that would result in a substantial change to local agricultural revenues. (See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.)

**Economic Benefit.** Employment of construction personnel would be beneficial to local businesses and the regional economy through increased expenditure of wages for goods and services. Personnel for construction would be drawn from local populations in Imperial and San Diego Counties, creating new temporary and permanent employment in these counties. A limited number of construction personnel would require temporary housing, likely in local hotels, and would purchase food, beverages, and other commodities, which would provide economic benefit to the local economy (Class IV).

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

**AG-1a Avoid interference with agricultural operations.**

**AG-1c Coordinate with grazing operators.**

### *Impact S-2: Construction would disrupt the existing utility systems or cause a collocation accident (Class II, Class III)*

Construction of tower foundations would not be within any roadways, thereby avoiding any utilities in roads. However, the alternative route would cross and parallel an existing SDG&E 69 kV lines causing the potential for an existing utility disruption in the event of an accident. The Modified Route D Alternative would also be closely aligned with a potential utility corridor identified in the Federal West Wide Corridor Study (Draft Programmatic EIS to be released in June 2007). Under PSU-APM-1, SDG&E would coordinate with all utility providers with facilities located within or adjacent to the project to ensure that design does not conflict with other utilities. With implementation of PSU-APM-2 (which has similar requirements to California Government Code §§4216-4216.9), Underground Service Alert would be notified a minimum of 48 hours in advance of earth-disturbing activities in order to identify any buried utility lines. Accidental disruptions would be low in this remote area with overhead construction. Compliance with California Government Code §§4216-4216.9 (see Anza–Borrego Link impact discussion in Section D.14.5 for more detail) and APMs PSU-APM-1 and PSU-APM-2 would reduce the likelihood of accidental disruptions. Therefore, potential impacts related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

**Agricultural Lands.** The Modified Route D Alternative would traverse Active Agricultural Operations (grazing operations) between MP MRD-1 and MRD-3, MP MRD-4 and MRD-10, MP MRD-11 and MRD-15, MP MRD-17 and MRD-18, MP MRD-19 and MRD-21, MP MRD-28 and MRD-30, MP MRD-32 and MRD-34, and MP MRD-37 and MRD-38. On off-road agricultural lands there is the potential to accidentally disrupt underground irrigation pipes during excavation or other ground disturbing construction activities (Class II). However, under Mitigation Measure AG-1a SDG&E must coordinate with property owners and tenants to ensure that project construction will be conducted so as to avoid interference with agricultural operations. (See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.) Implementation of Mitigation Measure AG-1a would reduce impacts to Active Agricultural Operations and disruption to existing agricultural irrigation systems to less than significant levels.

### *Mitigation Measure for Impact S-2: Construction would disrupt the existing utility systems or cause a collocation accident*

**AG-1a Avoid interference with agricultural operations.**

### *Impact S-3: Project construction and operation would increase the need for public services and facilities (Class III)*

Because construction activities and techniques would be the same as for the Proposed Project, water usage, solid waste generation, and public services requirements would be similar for this alternative on a per-mile/structure basis for overhead construction. Estimated water usage and solid waste generation for the Proposed Project is discussed in Section B (Project Description).

**Water**. An average of 27,000 gallons per day of water would be used for dust control and 36 gallons/yard$^3$ of water would be used for tower construction (including water used for concrete production). This quantity would be reduced with use of soil binders, as specified in Mitigation Measure AQ-1a in Section D.11 (Air Quality). Most of the area surrounding the alternative route is supplied by well water. As a result, water would likely be obtained from SDCWA from the Morena Reservoir (owned by the City of San Diego), Barrett Lake (owned by the City of San Diego), Loveland Reservoir (owned by Sweetwater Authority), and/or El Capitan Reservoir (owned by the City of San Diego). Water use during project construction would be a comparatively small fraction of the total water supply for the jurisdictions affected by the Modified Route D Alternative and would not change the ability of the water suppliers identified in Section D.14.2 to serve the alternative area demands (Class III).

Although the impact would be less than significant, reclaimed water would also be available in surrounding districts. SDG&E would have to contract with providers to obtain reclaimed water where it is available, and its use would reduce the amount of potable water needed from local water districts along the route. With availability for use of soil binders (see Mitigation Measure AQ-1a) and reclaimed water, in addition to nearby districts with available water, in the event that water suppliers are not able to supply the full amount of water required during construction in the summer months, alternative means of procuring water and/or reducing water usage would be available as not to significantly impact water suppliers. No mitigation is required; however, implementation of Mitigation Measure S-3b (Use reclaimed water), would further reduce impacts on local and regional water supplies by encouraging use of reclaimed water where possible. (See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.)

**Solid Waste**. A percentage of excavated material would be clean and dry and would be spread along the ROW. Under this alternative there would be no structure removal. The closest landfills along the alternative route would be the (CIWMB, 2007):

- Allied Imperial Landfill (104 East Robinson Road) that allows a maximum permitted throughput of 1,135 tons/day and has a remaining capacity of 2,105,500 cubic yards
- Imperial Solid Waste Site (1705 West Worthington Road) that allows a maximum permitted throughput of 207 tons/day and has a remaining capacity of 183,871 cubic yards
- Sycamore Sanitary Landfill (8514 Mast Boulevard ) that allows a maximum of 3,965 tons/day and has a remaining capacity of 47,388,428 cubic yards. The Sycamore Sanitary Landfill accepts asbestos, contaminated soil, mixed municipal waste, sludge (biosolids), agricultural, dead animals, tires, shreds, and wood waste (including treated wood)
- Otay Landfill (1700 Maxwell Road, Chula Vista) that allows a maximum of 5,830 tons/day and has a remaining capacity of 33,070,879 cubic yards.

Due to the number and capacity of landfills serving the alternative area, capacity for materials generated from construction would be available. Estimated solid waste generation for excavation and other construction activities is listed in Section B.4.9 (Removal of Facilities and Waste Disposal) for the Proposed Project. It is assumed that the Modified Route D Alternative would generate a similar quantity solid waste on a per-mile basis. However, because there would be no removal of existing facilities and the route would be shorter overall (used in conjunction with the Interstate 8 Alternative), the total waste generation would be reduced. In addition, recycling activities would greatly reduce the quantity of construction-related materials transported to local landfills.

As the waste generated by construction would occur over an extended period and would be dispersed among the various landfills serving the entire project route, the daily waste exported off site would be a fraction of the maximum daily throughput for any of the landfills listed above and the landfills have adequate remaining capacity. The Sycamore Sanitary Landfill would accept any contaminated soil, if encountered. Therefore, construction waste generated by the Proposed Project would not substantially affect the remaining capacities of local landfills to serve local demands (Class III). Although impacts to solid waste facilities would not be significant and no mitigation is required, to further reduce adverse effects of the cumulative volume of waste, Mitigation Measure S-3a (Recycle construction waste) would be recommended for implementation to ensure that maximum recycling activities would occur. (See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.)

**Fire Protection Services**. Any increase in potential fire hazards resulting from construction would increase temporary demands for fire protection services and is discussed in Section E.4.15 (Fire and Fuels Management).

***Mitigation Measure for Impact S-3: Project construction and operation would increase the need for public services and facilities***

**S-3a Recycle construction waste.**

**S-3b Use reclaimed water.**

## Operational Impacts

From an operational perspective, presence of the transmission line and associated facilities would not disrupt actual use of business properties or structures for the Modified Route D Alternative. Access to all businesses would be fully restored once construction of the project is complete. The transmission line would be located near business properties, but it would not remove any businesses along the route or cause any use to change. In light of the aforementioned reasons, no business-related impacts would occur and there would be no substantial change in revenues during operation (Impact S-1). This operational impact is not discussed under each alternative or the Star Valley Option.

Increased demands on emergency services would occur if operation of an alternative would increase the risk of wildland fires. Fire risk related to operation of transmission lines is discussed in greater detail in Section E.4.15 (Fire and Fuels Management) and is not addressed in this section. There is also the potential for a socioeconomic effect on local communities and other values at risk as a result of fire hazard, because a project-related fire or a fire that grows larger as a result of the presence of the project would have a significant effect on local communities. Cost of fire suppression is also discussed in Section E.4.15 (Fire and Fuels Management) and is not addressed here.

***Impact S-3: Project construction and operation would increase the need for public services and facilities (Class III)***

During operation and maintenance, insulator washing, which would occur a maximum of twice a year, would require 300 gallons of water per structure and 3,000 gallons of water per day. Similar to the proposed route, water would be trucked to the individual structures likely from the existing SDG&E Kearny O&M facility; however, compared to water usage during project construction and the overall available supply from surrounding districts, water for washing would be minor and impacts on existing resources and suppliers would be less than significant (Class III).

***Impact S-4: Property tax revenues from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies (Class IV)***

Local property tax revenues are a function of tax rates charged within the affected jurisdictions. Like with the Proposed Project, SDG&E's property taxes would increase as a result of the alternative route on private lands. Cleveland National Forest would receive no tax revenue from the installation of the project on Forest lands, because local tax revenues do not accrue on federal lands. However, CNF does collect fees annually for ROW Grants. An annual land use rent is determined from a Linear ROW Fee Schedule (inflation adjusted). The CY 2007 fee for an electric line ROW in San Diego County is $43.81 per acre of ROW per year (CNF, 2007). The alternative would not result in an adverse change in public resource revenue. Furthermore, the Modified Route D Alternative would not preclude or limit the operations of any public agency or result in a change in revenue to any public agencies. Increases to public agency revenues as a result of the Modified Route D Alternative are considered a beneficial (Class IV) impact. Therefore, no mitigation measures are recommended.

***Impact S-5: Presence of the project would decrease property values (Class III)***

During the public scoping process for the Proposed Project, the public expressed a great deal of interest and concern regarding the potential impacts of transmission line projects on property values. As such, the discussion of Impact S-5 under the Imperial Valley Link (see Section D.14.5.1) addresses in detail the issues associated with the potential for impacts on property values and industrial facilities such as transmission lines in an effort to provide the reader with detailed background information based on extensive literature review and the property value issues of past similar projects. As also discussed in Section D.14.5.1, any changes in property values would not be a substantial decrease and this impact is considered to be less than significant (Class III). Although not required because the impact is less than significant, it should be noted that implementation of mitigation measures in the Visual Resources section (Section E.4.3), such as Mitigation Measures V-3a (Reduce visual contrast of towers and conductors) and other visual resources mitigation specific to Key Viewpoints, would help to reduce the visual impacts of the project, which is one of the components perceived to affect property values. See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.

## E.4.14.3 Modified Route D Substation

With the Modified Route D Substation, the transmission line would convert to 230 kV at a new Modified Route D Alternative Substation, and would connect overhead to meet the Interstate 8 Alternative. This 500/230 kV substation would be required to convert from 500 to 230 kV before the underground segment in Alpine Boulevard. As shown in Figure E.4.1-2, the Modified Route D Alternative Substation would be located on private land west of Japatul Valley Road. It would be the same size (about 40 acres) as the proposed Central East Substation, and it would have to accommodate future 230 kV circuits exiting the substation when demand growth justifies the need for additional lines.

The overhead double-circuit 230 kV transmission line would exit the substation, continue north for about 2 miles to I-8, then turn west to transition underground at the same point as the Interstate 8 Alternative (at the east end of Alpine Boulevard).

Significance criteria for the SWPL alternatives are the same as for the Proposed Project (see Section D.14). As a result of the remote location, Impact S-1 (Project construction and/or transmission line presence would cause a change in revenue for businesses) would not occur. As discussed in Section B.5.1, once constructed, general substation monitoring and control functions are performed remotely from SDG&E central operations facility in San Diego. Regular operation would require one or two workers to visit the substation on a weekly basis.

***Impact S-2: Construction would disrupt the existing utility systems or cause a collocation accident (Class III)***

The Modified Route D Substation would be located on vacant private land with no residents or businesses within at least 1,000 feet. Therefore, the likelihood of encountering utility systems is low. However, there are scattered residences in the area and along the new access road from Japatul Valley Road to the substation gate. In addition there would be grading and earthwork. Therefore, during grading and access road installation there is the potential to encounter and disrupt existing underground utilities.

Under PSU-APM-1, SDG&E would coordinate with all utility providers with facilities located within or adjacent to the substation and overhead lines to ensure that design does not conflict with other utilities. With implementation of PSU-APM-2 (which has similar requirements to California Government Code §§4216-4216.9), Underground Service Alert would be notified a minimum of 48 hours in advance of

earth-disturbing activities in order to identify any buried utility lines. Compliance with California Government Code §§4216-4216.9 (see Anza–Borrego Link impact discussion for more detail) and APMs PSU-APM-1 and PSU-APM-2 would ensure that the potential impacts related to a collocation accident or utility disruption would be less than significant (Class III). No mitigation is required.

### *Impact S-3: Project construction and operation would increase the need for public services and facilities (Class III)*

**Water.** The amount of water required depends on the length of access roads used, weather conditions, road surface conditions, and other site-specific conditions. Dust suppression efforts would be similar to the Central East Substation site (see Section D.14.7 and Table B-4a in Section B for estimated total water usage for the proposed Central East Substation) and would occur on each day that grading activities take place and when construction vehicles use unpaved access roads. Most of the area surrounding the alternative route is supplied by well water. As a result, water would likely be obtained from SDCWA from the Morena Reservoir (owned by the City of San Diego), Barrett Lake (owned by the City of San Diego), Loveland Reservoir (owned by Sweetwater Authority), and/or El Capitan Reservoir (owned by the City of San Diego). Water use during project construction would be a comparatively small fraction of the total water supply for the jurisdictions affected by the Modified Route D Alternative and would not change the ability of the water suppliers identified in Section D.14.2 in serving the alternative area demands (Class III).

Although the impact would be less than significant, reclaimed water would also be available in surrounding districts. There are 22 recycled water facilities within SDCWA's territory. SDG&E would have to contract with providers to obtain reclaimed water where it is available, and its use would reduce the amount of potable water needed from local water districts in the substation area. With availability for use of soil binders (see Mitigation Measure AQ-1a) and reclaimed water, in addition to nearby districts with available water, in the event that water suppliers are not able to supply the full amount of water required during construction in the summer months, alternative means of procuring water and/or reducing water usage would be available as not to significantly impact water suppliers. No mitigation is required; however, implementation of Mitigation Measure S-3b (Use reclaimed water), would further reduce impacts on local and regional water supplies by encouraging use of reclaimed water where possible. (See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.)

**Solid Waste.** Modified Route D Substation construction would generate waste largely in the form of soil from extensive earthwork and grading. No existing structures would be removed. Estimated solid waste generation for excavation and other construction activities is listed in Section B.4.9 (Removal of Facilities and Waste Disposal). Total solid waste generation would include 2,400 cubic yards for substation grading/site work, 3,500 cubic yards for below-grade substation construction, and 2,500 cubic yards for above-grade substation construction. Some of the waste management companies in San Diego County that serve the Modified Route D area are discussed under Section E.4.14.1 above. Due to the number and capacity of landfills serving the project area, capacity for materials generated from construction of the Modified Route D Substation would be available.

As the waste generated during construction of the Modified Route D Substation would be similar to the Central East Substation and the schedule would also likely occur over a 30-month period (see Table B-10 in Section B.4.7, Construction Schedule for the Central East Substation) and be dispersed among the various landfills serving the entire alternative route, the daily waste exported off site would be a minute fraction of the maximum daily throughput for any of the landfills identified. Therefore, construction waste generated by the Modified Route D Substation would not substantially affect the remain-

ing capacities of local landfills to serve local demands (Class III). Although impacts to solid waste facilities would not be significant and no mitigation is required, to further reduce adverse effects of the cumulative volume of waste from all of the SWPL alternative, Mitigation Measure S-3a (Recycle construction waste) would be recommended for implementation for Modified Route D Substation construction to ensure that maximum recycling activities would occur. (See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.)

**Public Services.** *Construction Workers Demands*. Because of the large available labor pool in San Diego County and nearby areas, few construction workers are expected to temporarily relocate to the area. These worker likely live in the San Diego area and may already work for SDG&E. Therefore, they would not generate additional population that would exceed the capacity of local public service providers discussed above for the Modified Route D Alternative. Construction of the substation would not result in a direct increase in the local population, leading to long-term demands to local public services (see also Section H.2, Growth-Inducing Effects, for a complete discussion of population impacts). Nor would the Proposed Project result in any long-term requirements that would place a permanent increased demand on emergency service providers that would result in new or expanded facilities. Therefore, the temporary addition of construction personnel would not substantially increase any demands on schools or hospitals or lower the level of service for fire protection or police protection in the long term, nor would it require the construction or expansion of facilities or services (Class III).

*Fire Hazards*. Section E.4.15 (Fire and Fuels Management) discusses how temporary construction activities would result in an increase in potential fire hazards and would increase temporary demands for fire protection services.

*Emergency Services*. Construction of the project and equipment would impede emergency access through the area. With implementation of APM PSU-APM-3, SDG&E would be required to coordinate construction schedules, lane closures, and other activities associated with installation of the project with emergency and police services to ensure that disruption to response times and access is minimized as not to significant affect response times. Impacts to emergency access are discussed under Section D.9 (Transportation and Traffic), which concludes that such impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts to emergency access and/or public services and facilities would be less than significant (Class III) and no mitigation is required.

#### *Mitigation Measure for Impact S-3: Project construction and operation would increase the need for public services and facilities*

**S-3a** **Recycle construction waste.**

**S-3b** **Use reclaimed water.**

#### *Impact S-4: Property tax revenues from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies (Class IV)*

Local property tax revenues are a function of tax rates charged within the affected jurisdictions. Like with the Proposed Project, SDG&E's property taxes would increase as a result of the Modified Route D Substation and overhead route option on private lands. The alternative would not result in an adverse change in public resource revenue. Furthermore, the Modified Route D Substation and access roads would not preclude or limit the operations of any public agency or result in a change in revenue to any public agencies. Increases to public agency revenues as a result of the Modified Route D Substation are considered a beneficial (Class IV) impact. Therefore, no mitigation measures are recommended.

***Impact S-5: Presence of the project would decrease property values (Class III)***

Properties would be far enough from the substation site that, as discussed in the studies described in Section D.14.5.1, any impacts to property value would be less than significant. The structures would cause some partial view blockage of the background hill slopes and ridges, but as found in the Crockett Cogeneration Project study, it has not been demonstrated that a view obstruction would be a major factor in a property value decline. Coupled with distance from the facility and the fact that studies have found that any adverse property value impacts diminish within five years of completion of the project, this impact would be less than significant (Class III).

## E.4.14.4 Star Valley Option

The Star Valley Option would convert to 230 kV at the Modified Route D Alternative Substation west of Japatul Valley Road (as discussed above in Section E.4.14.1), would exit the substation overhead for 2.5 miles, then would transition underground at Star Valley Road. On the southwest side of the bend in Star Valley Road, the route would transition underground and continue north approximately 1,900 feet to Alpine Boulevard. This option would join the Interstate 8 Alternative at Alpine Boulevard.

The socioeconomic, public services and utilities setting would be the same as for the Modified Route D Alternative (see Section E.4.14.1) and the Interstate 8 Alternative in this section (see Section E.1.14). Significance criteria for the SWPL alternatives are the same as for the Proposed Project (see Section D.14).

### Construction Impacts

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

**Revenue from Business Operations.** Business uses occur along Star Valley Road and Alpine Boulevard, but the project would not require the removal or relocation of any business uses. Impacts on local businesses would result from degradation of views, views of construction equipment and activity, vehicular or pedestrian access restrictions, land use, air quality, and noise effects, or health and safety concerns (such as EMF). These issues are analyzed in this document in Sections E.4.3 (Visual Resources), E.4.4 (Land Use), E.4D.8 (Noise), E.4.9 (Traffic/Transportation), and E.4.10 (Public Health and Safety). Where impacts for these issue areas are found to be less than significant or have been mitigated to less than significant levels, any associated loss of local business revenue impacts would not be significant. In addition, most of the impacts would be short-term construction impacts that have been found to not be significant (Class III). Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are recommended outside of those presented in Sections E.4.3 (Visual Resources), E.4.9 (Traffic/Transportation), E.4.4 (Land Use), and E.4.10 (Public Health and Safety) to mitigate potential impacts that would result in a substantial change to local business revenues. See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.

**Economic Benefit.** Employment of construction personnel would be beneficial to local businesses in and around Alpine and the regional economy through increased expenditure of wages for goods and services. Personnel for construction would be drawn from local populations in San Diego County, creating new temporary and permanent employment in these counties. A limited number of construction personnel would require temporary housing, likely in local hotels, and would purchase food, beverages, and other commodities, which would provide economic benefit to the local economy (Class IV).

### *Impact S-2: Construction would disrupt the existing utility systems or cause a collocation accident (Class II)*

In addition to the impacts discussed for the Modified Route D Alternative, the Star Valley Option would include a 230 kV underground route (approximately 1,900 feet), which has a greater potential to accidentally disrupt underground utilities in the roadways or require service interruption, especially in the area of Alpine Boulevard. However, it would also eliminate the first few miles of underground construction with the Interstate 8 Alternative, which would reduce those impacts and construction in the congested Alpine Boulevard. Overall and regardless of location, the impacts of underground construction are considered potentially significant, but can be mitigated to less than significant levels (Class II) with the implementation of Mitigation Measure S-2a (Notify public of utility service interruption). See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.

Under PSU-APM-1, SDG&E would coordinate with all utility providers with facilities located within or adjacent to the project to ensure that design does not conflict with other utilities. With implementation of PSU-APM-2 (which has similar requirements to California Government Code §§4216-4216.9), Underground Service Alert would be notified a minimum of 48 hours in advance of earth-disturbing activities in order to identify any buried utility lines. Compliance with California Government Code §§4216-4216.9 (see Anza–Borrego Link impact discussion in Section D.14.5 for more detail) and APMs PSU-APM-1 and PSU-APM-2 would reduce the likelihood of accidental disruptions; however, accidental disruptions could still occur (especially during the underground segment). This impact is considered potentially significant, but can be mitigated to less than significant levels (Class II) with the implementation of Mitigation Measure S-2b (Protect underground utilities). See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.

### *Mitigation Measure for Impact S-2: Construction would disrupt the existing utility systems or cause a collocation accident*

**S-2a Notify public of utility service interruption.**

**S-2b Protect underground utilities.**

### *Impact S-3: Project construction and operation would increase the need for public services and facilities (Class III)*

Because construction activities and techniques would be the same as for the Proposed Project, water usage, solid waste generation, and public services requirements would be similar for this alternative option on a per-mile/structure basis for overhead and underground construction (see Section D.14). Estimated water usage and solid waste generation for the Proposed Project is discussed in Section B (Project Description).

**Water**. Most of the area surrounding the alternative route is supplied by well water. As a result, water would likely be obtained from SDCWA from the Morena Reservoir (owned by the City of San Diego), Barrett Lake (owned by the City of San Diego), Loveland Reservoir (owned by Sweetwater Authority), and/or El Capitan Reservoir (owned by the City of San Diego). Water use during project construction of the Star Valley Option would be a comparatively small fraction of the total water supply for the jurisdictions affected by the Modified Route D Alternative as a whole and would not change the ability of the water suppliers identified in Section D.14.2 to serve the alternative area demands (Class III).

Although the impact would be less than significant, reclaimed water would also be available in surrounding districts. There are 22 recycled water facilities within SDCWA's territory. SDG&E would have to contract with providers to obtain reclaimed water where it is available, and its use would reduce the amount of potable water needed from local water districts along the route. With availability for use of soil binders (see Mitigation Measure AQ-1a) and reclaimed water, in addition to nearby districts with

available water, in the event that water suppliers are not able to supply the full amount of water required during construction in the summer months, alternative means of procuring water and/or reducing water usage would be available as not to significantly impact water suppliers. No mitigation is required; however, implementation of Mitigation Measure S-3b (Use reclaimed water), would further reduce impacts on local and regional water supplies by encouraging use of reclaimed water where possible. (See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.)

**Solid Waste.** A percentage of excavated material would be clean and dry and would be spread along the ROW. Under this alternative there would be no structure removal. The closest landfills along the alternative route would be the (CIWMB, 2007):

- Sycamore Sanitary Landfill (8514 Mast Boulevard ) that allows a maximum of 3,965 tons/day and has a remaining capacity of 47,388,428 cubic yards. The Sycamore Sanitary Landfill accepts asbestos, contaminated soil, mixed municipal waste, sludge (biosolids), agricultural, dead animals, tires, shreds, and wood waste (including treated wood); and
- Otay Landfill (1700 Maxwell Road, Chula Vista) that allows a maximum of 5,830 tons/day and has a remaining capacity of 33,070,879 cubic yards.

Due to the number and capacity of landfills serving the alternative area, capacity for materials generated from construction would be available. Estimated solid waste generation for excavation and other construction activities is listed in Section B.4.9 (Removal of Facilities and Waste Disposal) for the Proposed Project. It is assumed that the Star Valley would generate a similar quantity solid waste on a per-mile basis for overhead and underground construction. Recycling activities would greatly reduce the quantity of construction-related materials transported to local landfills.

As the waste generated by construction would occur over an extended period and would be dispersed among the various landfills serving the entire project route, the daily waste exported off site would be a fraction of the maximum daily throughput for any of the landfills listed above and the landfills have adequate remaining capacity. The Sycamore Sanitary Landfill would accept any contaminated soil, if encountered. Therefore, construction waste generated by the Proposed Project would not substantially affect the remaining capacities of local landfills to serve local demands (Class III). Although impacts to solid waste facilities would not be significant and no mitigation is required, to further reduce adverse effects of the cumulative volume of waste, Mitigation Measure S-3a (Recycle construction waste) would be recommended for implementation to ensure that maximum recycling activities would occur. (See Appendix 12 for the full text of the mitigation measures.)

**Fire Protection Services.** Any increase in potential fire hazards resulting from construction would increase temporary demands for fire protection services and is discussed in Section E.4.15 (Fire and Fuels Management) and is not discussed here.

#### *Mitigation Measure for Impact S-3: Project construction and operation would increase the need for public services and facilities*

**S-3a** **Recycle construction waste.**

**S-3b** **Use reclaimed water.**

### Operational Impacts

Increased demands on emergency services would occur if operation of an alternative would increase the risk of wildland fires. Fire risk related to operation of transmission lines is discussed in greater detail in Section D.15 (Fire and Fuels Management) and is not addressed in this section. There is also the potential

for a socioeconomic effect on local communities and other values at risk as a result of fire hazard, because a project-related fire or a fire that grows larger as a result of the presence of the project would have a significant effect on local communities far surpassing the cost of suppressing the fire. Cost of fire suppression is also discussed in Section E.4.15 (Fire and Fuels Management) and is not addressed here.

***Impact S-3: Project construction and operation would increase the need for public services and facilities (Class III)***

During operation and maintenance of the overhead portion of the Star Valley Option, insulator washing, which would occur a maximum of twice a year, would require 300 gallons of water per structure and 3,000 gallons of water per day on the overhead portion of the option. Similar to the proposed route, water would be trucked to the individual structures likely from the existing SDG&E Kearny O&M facility; however, since a portion of this route option would be underground and would not require insulator washing, water for washing would be minor and impacts on existing resources and suppliers would be less than significant (Class III).

***Impact S-4: Property tax revenues from project presence would substantially benefit public agencies (Class IV)***

Local property tax revenues are a function of tax rates charged within the affected jurisdictions. As with the Proposed Project, SDG&E's property taxes would increase as a result of the route option on private lands. The alternative would not result in an adverse change in public resource revenue. Furthermore, the Star Valley Option would not preclude or limit the operations of any public agency or result in a change in revenue to any public agencies. Increases to public agency revenues as a result of the Star Valley Option are considered a beneficial (Class IV) impact. Therefore, no mitigation measures are recommended.

***Impact S-5: Presence of the project would decrease property values (Class III)***

During the public scoping process for the Proposed Project, the public expressed a great deal of interest and concern regarding the potential impacts of transmission line projects on property values. As such, the discussion of Impact S-5 under the Imperial Valley Link (see Section D.14.5.1) addresses in detail the issues associated with the potential for impacts on property values and industrial facilities such as transmission lines in an effort to provide the reader with detailed background information based on extensive literature review and the property value issues of past similar projects. As also discussed in Section D.14.5.1, any changes in property values would not be a substantial decrease and this impact is considered to be less than significant (Class III). Although not required because the impact is less than significant, it should be noted that implementation of mitigation measures in the Visual Resources section (Section D.3), such as Mitigation Measures V-3a (Reduce visual contrast of towers and conductors) and other visual resources mitigation specific to Key Viewpoints, would help to reduce the visual impacts of the project, which is one of the components perceived to affect property values. Approximately 1,900 feet of the option would also be located underground in Star Valley Road to Alpine Boulevard.

## E.4.14.5 PCT Reroute Option C/D

The PCT Reroute Option C/D is described in Section E.4.1.3 and illustrated on Figures E.4.1-1b and E.4.1-1c. This route option would diverge from the Modified Route D Alternative route at MP MRD-10.8 and rejoin the route at MP MRD-14.

Due to the regional nature of socioeconomic resources and the close proximity between the Modified Route D Alternative (PCT Reroute Option A) and the PCT Reroute Option C/D, the environmental

setting of the PCT Reroute Option C/D would be the same as for the corresponding segment of the Modified Route D (MP MRD-10.8 to MRD-14). For this same reason, Impacts S-1 through S-5 as detailed in Section E.4.14.2 and all mitigation measures identified for the Modified Route D Alternative would apply to the PCT Reroute Option C/D.

## E.4.14.6~~5~~ Future Transmission System Expansion

For the Proposed Project and route alternatives along the Proposed Project route, Section B.2.7 identifies Future Transmission System Expansion routes for both 230 kV and 500 kV future transmission lines. These routes are identified, and impacts are analyzed in Section D of this EIR/EIS, because SDG&E has indicated that transmission system expansion is foreseeable, possibly within the next 10 years. For the SWPL alternatives, 500 kV and 230 kV expansions would also be possible. The potential expansion routes for the Route D Alternative are described in the following paragraphs.

### 230 and 500 kV Future Transmission System Expansion

The Modified Route D Alternative would begin at approximately Interstate 8 MP-47 and would head southwest then northward until it reached the Interstate 8 Alternative at approximately MP I8-71. A substation could be built to convert the 500 kV line to 230 kV at approximately MD-34, the Modified Route D Substation Alternative. The double-circuit 230 kV line would exit the substation overhead, then continue north into the CNF, joining the Interstate 8 Alternative at approximately MP I8-71 where it transitions to underground at the east end of Alpine Boulevard. The Modified Route D Substation would accommodate up to six 230 kV circuits and a 500 kV circuit. Only two 230 kV circuits are proposed at this time, but construction of additional 230 kV circuits and a 500 kV circuit out of the Modified Route D Substation may be required in the future. There are three routes that are most likely for these future lines; each is described below. Figure E.1.1-6 illustrates the potential routes of the future transmission lines.

- Two additional 230 kV circuits could be installed underground within Alpine Boulevard, with appropriate compact duct banks and engineering to avoid, or possibly relocate, existing utilities. This route would follow the Interstate 8 Alternative route from the Interstate 8 Alternative Substation until MP I8-70.8 where it would transition underground until MP I8-79 where it would transition overhead again. The future transmission line route would continue to follow the Interstate 8 Alternative's overhead 230 kV route to the point where it meets the Proposed Project at MP 131. See Section E.1.14.1 and E.1.14.2 for the Socioeconomics setting, impacts, and mitigation measures along the I-8 route. The future transmission route would then join the proposed route corridor to the west, continuing past the Sycamore Canyon Substation to the Chicarita Substation. See Section D.14.2, D.14.8, and D.14.9 for the Socioeconomics setting, impacts, and mitigation measures for the Inland Valley and Coastal Links. It could then follow the Proposed Project's 230 kV Future Transmission Expansion route (see description in Section B.2.7) from Chicarita to the Escondido Substation shown in Figure B-12a. See Section D.14.11 for the Socioeconomics, Services, and Utilities setting, impacts, and mitigation measures for the Future Transmission System Expansion of the Proposed Project.
- Additional 230 and 500 kV circuits could follow the Route D Alternative corridor (see description in Section E.3.1) to the north of Descanso, after following the Interstate 8 Alternative 230 kV route from the Interstate 8 Substation to MP I8 70.3. See Section E.3.14.1 and E.3.14.2 for the Socioeconomics setting, impacts, and mitigation measures along Route D. The Route D corridor would connect with the Proposed Project corridor at Milepost 114.5, and could then follow either: (1) the Proposed Project southwest to the Chicarita Substation and then follow the Proposed Project's 230 kV Future Transmission Expansion route (see description in Section B.2.7) from Chicarita to the Escon-

dido Substation; or (2) the Proposed Project northeast to the Proposed Central East Substation and then follow the Proposed Project's 500 kV Future Transmission Expansion route shown in Figure B-12b (see description in Section B.2.7). See Section D.14.2, D.14.7, D.14.8, and D.14.9 for the Socioeconomics, Services, and Utilities setting, impacts, and mitigation measures for the Central, Inland Valley, and Coastal Links of the Proposed Project. See Section D.14.11 for the Socioeconomics, Services, and Utilities setting, impacts, and mitigation measures for the Future Transmission System Expansion of the Proposed Project.

- The future 230 and 500 kV lines could follow the Modified Route D Alternative corridor (within the 368 Corridor identified by the Department of Energy's Draft West-wide Corridor Programmatic EIS) south for 8 miles to MP MD-26. See Section E.4.14.1 for the Socioeconomics setting, impacts, and mitigation measures along Modified Route D. At MP MD-26, new 230 or 500 kV circuits would turn west and connect with the northernmost segment of the West of Forest Alternative route as described in Section E.1.1. See Section E.1.14.5 for the Socioeconomics setting, impacts, and mitigation measures along MP MD-26 to MP I8-79 corridor. This route would meet up with the Interstate 8 Alternative at approximately MP I8-79 and would follow the Interstate 8 Alternative's overhead 230 kV route to the point where it meets the Proposed Project at MP 131 (for a description of the Interstate 8 transmission corridor see Section E.1.1). The future transmission route would then join the proposed route corridor to the west, continuing past the Sycamore Canyon Substation to the Chicarita Substation. It could then follow the Proposed Project's 230 kV Future Transmission Expansion System (see description in Section B.2.7) from Chicarita to the Escondido Substation. See Section D.14.11 for the Socioeconomics, Services, and Utilities setting, impacts, and mitigation measures for the Future Transmission System Expansion of the Proposed Project.