

4.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

4.13.1 Overview

This section addresses the potential Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project (TRTP) impacts to population and housing within the Project area. The analysis describes the existing and forecasted conditions of population and housing in the study area, evaluates the regional employment and labor-force characteristics, and assesses the potential adverse social or economic effects resulting from Project-related activities. The proposed Project study area includes jurisdictions within Kern, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino counties.

A discussion of related issues is found elsewhere in this report, including Growth-inducing Impacts in Section 7.0, and Environmental Justice in Section 10.0. The analysis of cumulative impacts on population and housing is provided in Section 5.0, Cumulative Impacts.

In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15064(e), this Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA) does not address economic or social effects of the proposed Project because they are not expected to result in physical changes in the environment. The proposed Project, for example, would not result in the removal of any housing or businesses nor would it induce population growth that could indirectly result in the construction of new housing, roads, water supply systems, sewers, and other infrastructure and public services.

4.13.2 Technical Methodology

The evaluation examines baseline population, housing, and employment data for the affected jurisdictions and analyzes potential short-term and long-term impacts of Project construction and operation. Jurisdictions are included if they are traversed by the right-of-way (R-O-W).

Current demographic data is obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau, the California Department of Finance, and the California Labor Market Information Division of the Employment Development Department. Forecasted population, housing, and employment data are presented based on the most recently published California Labor Market Information Division, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), and Kern County Council of Governments (Kern COG) projections for jurisdictions, sub-regional areas, and major statistical areas, where available.

Additionally, the analysis includes data from the U.S. Department of Labor classification of Labor Surplus Areas (LSA), under Presidential Executive Orders 12073 and 10582. The basic LSA classification criteria are determined using thresholds of a "floor unemployment

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS
AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

SECTION 4.0

Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project

rate“ and a “ceiling unemployment rate,“ and assist in identifying geographic areas having the highest long-term unemployment rates in the nation. The significance of potential impacts to the project area is determined based on the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G significance criteria. With respect to CEQA, population and housing impacts are those that could be considered direct or indirect effects on the environment, rather than strictly economic effects.

4.13.3 Regulations, Plans, and Standards

4.13.3.1 Federal

No federal regulations, plans, and standards applicable to the proposed Project have been identified.

4.13.3.2 State

No state regulations, plans, and standards applicable to the proposed Project have been identified.

4.13.3.3 Local

4.13.3.3.1 Kern County. The Housing Element of the Kern County General Plan provides background information regarding housing and general policy guidance that relates to the proposed Project, but the Element does not contain housing policies applicable to the proposed Project.

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

4.13.3.3.3 Municipalities. While the municipalities within the proposed Project area have adopted general plans containing housing and general development policy guidance as per the California State Planning Law (Government Code Sections 65302 et seq.), no policies in these local general plans address population and housing aspects applicable to the proposed Project.

4.13.4 Significance Criteria

The criteria used in determining whether Project-related impacts would be significant are presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Impacts from the Project could be considered significant if they would:

- Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere

4.13.5 Applicant Proposed Measures

There are no Applicant Proposed Measures (APMs) for population and housing.

4.13.6 Proposed Project and Alternatives

The TRTP consists of eight segments. Segments 4, 5, and 10 involve upgrading and expanding SCE's transmission system north of SCE's Vincent Substation in order to integrate the Tehachapi area wind generation to SCE's electric system. Segments 6, 7, 8, and 10 involve upgrading and expanding SCE's transmission system south of SCE's Vincent Substation in order to deliver Tehachapi area wind generation to SCE's load centers. Segment 9 involves construction of one new substation and expansion or upgrades at existing SCE substations. The major components of these facilities are summarized in the following sections. Complete descriptions of these components are provided in Section 3.0 of this report.

4.13.6.1 Segment 4

4.13.6.1.1 Environmental Setting. Segment 4 traverses the unincorporated southern portion of Kern County, the unincorporated northern portion of Los Angeles County, and the City of Lancaster.

Table 4.13-1 presents current and forecasted population and percent change from 2000 through 2030 for the jurisdictions within the Segment 4 Project area. Kern County ranks as the thirteenth most populated county in California and in 2006 had the sixth largest numeric population increase in the state (Department of Finance, 2006). Kern County has recently experienced rapid population growth beginning just before 2000 and is projected to continue growing faster than the state as a whole. As indicated in Table 4.13-1, Kern County had a population of 661,645 in 2000 and the Kern Council of Governments (Kern COG) forecasts a 68.5 percent population increase to 1,114,878 by 2030.

TABLE 4.13-1
SEGMENT 4: TOTAL POPULATION AND PROJECTED GROWTH, 2000-2030¹

Jurisdiction	2000	2010	2020	2030	2000-2030 Change (%)
County of Kern	661,645	808,808	950,112	1,114,878	453,233 (68.5%)
County of Los Angeles	9,519,338	10,718,007	11,501,884	12,221,799	2,702,461 (28.4%)
City of Lancaster	118,718	168,032	215,468	259,696	140,978 (118.8%)

¹ Sources: Kern Council of Governments, 2000; Southern California Association of Governments, 2000; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The County of Los Angeles ranks as the highest populated county in the state, accounting for 27.6 percent of the state's overall population. Los Angeles County experienced the highest numeric population increase in the state in recent years and fourth largest in the nation from 2000 to 2006 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007). The population in Los Angeles County at the time of the 2000 Census was 9,519,338 and is projected to grow to 12,221,799 by 2030 (27.6 percent increase). The City of Lancaster had a population of 118,718 (Table 4.13-1) in the 2000 Census, and accounts for 1.2 percent of the total Los Angeles County population. The City is projected to grow at a staggering rate even by regional standards such that in 2030, the City of Lancaster's population is projected to increase 118.8 percent to 259,696.

Housing data for Segment 4 jurisdictions appears in Table 4.13-2. As shown, the forecasted housing increases for Kern and Los Angeles counties and the City of Lancaster correspond fairly closely to projected population increases.

TABLE 4.13-2
SEGMENT 4: HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS: 2000-2030¹

Jurisdiction	Housing Units, 2000	Vacancy Rate, 2000 (%)	Forecasted Housing Units, 2010	Forecasted Housing Units, 2020	Forecasted Housing Units, 2030	2000-2030 Change (%)
County of Kern	231,567	22,912 (9.9%)	278,899	327,625	384,441	152,874 (66.0%)
County of Los Angeles	3,137,047	137,135 (4.4%)	3,404,016	3,763,875	4,120,270	983,223 (31.3%)
City of Lancaster	38,289	3,473 (9.0%)	51,418	66,591	81,403	43,114 (112.6%)

¹ Sources: Kern Council of Governments, 2000; Southern California Association of Governments, 2000; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

Table 4.13-3 provides employment data for the Segment 4 jurisdictions based on the California Labor Market Division. The region as a whole has more than 5,000,000 workers and overall unemployment rates vary considerably from county to county. Kern County

TABLE 4.13-3
SEGMENT 4: LABOR FORCE CHARACTERISTICS: 2006¹

Jurisdiction	Labor Force	Employment	Unemployment (Rate, %)
County of Kern	338,400	312,800	25,600 (7.6%)
County of Los Angeles	4,860,600	4,613,600	229,000 (4.7%)
City of Lancaster	54,400	50,700	3,700 (6.8%)

¹ Source: 2006 Annual Average, California Labor Market Information, EDD. 2000.

historically has had high unemployment and the unemployment rate in 2006 was 7.6 percent. The US Labor Department now lists Kern County as an LSA. The City of Lancaster also has experienced high unemployment (6.8 percent in 2000) and it has also been designated a LSA. In comparison, Los Angeles County only had a 4.7 percent unemployment rate in 2006.

Table 4.13-4 provides major industry sector data for the region. These data indicate that despite some pockets of high unemployment, the region as a whole has a large and growing workforce. The construction workforce is most relevant to this analysis and in 2000 there were more than 360,000 construction workers in the region. The construction workforce in Kern County consisted of 13,300 participants in 2002 and is forecasted to increase 34.6 percent to 17,900 participants in 2012. In 2002 Los Angeles County had a construction workforce of 134,500 that is forecasted to increase to 149,700 by 2012.

4.13.6.1.2 Impact Analysis.

Impact Summary. This analysis examines the extent to which the Segment 4 construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed Project potentially impacts the forecasted increase in population and location of housing within the Project area. The significance of population and housing impacts depends on whether the proposed Project would create population in excess of projected growth, require the removal of housing, or cause a substantial change in local employment requiring the need for more housing. This analysis demonstrates that the TRTP would not cause significant impacts to population and housing.

Construction of Segment 4 would predominantly take place within or adjacent to an existing R-O-W that lacks habitable structures. This segment includes acquisition of new R-O-W that also lacks housing. Therefore, neither construction nor operation would require removal of housing units.

On a regional scale, Segment 4 traverses counties characterized by comparatively high populations with high growth rates forecast; this is consistent in serving the intrinsic purpose

SECTION 4.0**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS
AND MITIGATION MEASURES***Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project*

**TABLE 4.13-4
MAJOR INDUSTRY SECTOR CHARACTERISTICS¹
KERN, LOS ANGELES, AND SAN BERNARDINO COUNTIES**

Sector	Annual Employment, 2002 (% of Total Employment)	Forecasted Annual Employment, 2012 (% of Total Employment)	2002-2012 Change (%)
Kern County			
Construction	13,300 (6.5%)	17,900 (7.5%)	4,600 (34.6%)
Education and Health Service	20,700 (10.1%)	26,300 (11.0%)	5,600 (27.1%)
Financial Activities	8,000 (3.9%)	9,600 (4.0%)	1,600 (20.0%)
Government	55,200 (26.9%)	60,200 (25.1%)	5,000 (9.1%)
Information	2,500 (1.2%)	3,100 (1.3%)	600 (24.0%)
Leisure and Hospitality	17,600 (8.6%)	21,700 (9.0%)	4,100 (23.3%)
Manufacturing	11,600 (5.7%)	13,900 (5.8%)	2,300 (19.8%)
Natural Resources and Mining	7,900 (3.9%)	8,500 (3.5%)	600 (7.6%)
Professional and Business Services	22,400 (10.9%)	24,600 (10.3%)	2,200 (9.8%)
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	39,000 (19.0%)	46,300 (19.3%)	7,300 (18.7%)
Other Services	6,900 (3.4%)	7,900 (3.3%)	1,000 (14.5%)
Total Number of Positions	205,100 (100.0%)	240,000 (100.0%)	34,900 (17.0%)
Los Angeles County			
Construction	134,500 (3.3%)	149,700 (3.3%)	15,200 (11.3%)
Education and Health Service	450,400 (11.2%)	563,400 (12.6%)	113,000 (25.1%)
Financial Activities	232,600 (5.8%)	265,300 (5.9%)	32,700 (14.1%)
Government	606,100 (15.1%)	659,100 (14.7%)	53,000 (8.7%)
Information	207,300 (5.1%)	229,700 (5.1%)	22,400 (10.8%)
Leisure and Hospitality	354,200 (8.8%)	421,800 (9.4%)	67,600 (19.1%)
Manufacturing	534,800 (13.3%)	470,400 (10.5%)	[64,400] (-12.0%)
Natural Resources and Mining	3,700 (0.1%)	3,300 (0.1%)	[400] (-10.8%)
Professional and Business Services	575,000 (14.3%)	680,300 (15.2%)	105,300 (18.3%)
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	782,700 (19.4%)	884,100 (19.7%)	101,400 (13.0%)
Other Services	145,600 (3.6%)	158,400 (3.6%)	12,800 (8.8%)

TABLE 4.13-4 (CONTINUED)
MAJOR INDUSTRY SECTOR CHARACTERISTICS
KERN, LOS ANGELES, AND SAN BERNARDINO COUNTIES

Sector	Annual Employment, 2002 (% of Total Employment)	Forecasted Annual Employment, 2012 (% of Total Employment)	2002-2012 Change (%)
Total Number of Positions	4,026,800 (100.0%)	4,485,500 (100.0%)	458,700 (11.4%)
San Bernardino County			
Construction	90,900 (8.5%)	126,700 (9.2%)	35,800 (39.4%)
Education and Health Service	112,400 (10.6%)	146,400 (10.6%)	34,000 (30.2%)
Financial Activities	39,500 (3.7%)	52,300 (3.8%)	12,800 (32.4%)
Government	212,700 (20.0%)	258,800 (18.7%)	46,100 (21.7%)
Information	14,100 (1.3%)	16,200 (1.2%)	2,100 (14.9%)
Leisure and Hospitality	107,200 (10.1%)	138,600 (10.0%)	31,400 (29.3%)
Manufacturing	115,400 (10.8%)	129,300 (9.4%)	13,900 (12.0%)
Natural Resources and Mining	1,200 (0.1%)	1,300 (0.1%)	100 (8.3%)
Professional and Business Services	106,800 (10.0%)	159,700 (11.6%)	52,900 (49.5%)
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	225,400 (21.2%)	306,900 (22.2%)	81,500 (36.2%)
Other Services	38,100 (3.4%)	45,800 (3.3%)	7,700 (20.2%)
Total Number of Positions	1,063,700 (100.0%)	1,382,000 (100.0%)	318,300 (29.9%)

¹ Source: California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information. 2007.

and need for the proposed Project, as described in Section 1.0, Purpose and Need and Objectives. On a local level, existing and projected population and housing data for the jurisdictions located within the Segment 4 Project area appear in Tables 4.13-1 and 4.13-2. As indicated in these tables, Segment 4 would traverse areas undergoing high population and housing growth. This growth however, is expected to occur regardless of the implementation of the proposed Project. As discussed in Section 7.0, Growth-Inducing Impacts, the proposed expansion and upgrade of SCE's transmission system would not induce growth, but rather is responsive to projected growth rates and necessary to accommodate existing and forecasted energy demand.

Construction of a project has the potential to induce population growth in an area in the event that the regional construction workforce is not sufficient to serve the needs of the project construction, and workers consequently have to relocate to the project area.

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS
AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

SECTION 4.0

Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project

Construction of the entire proposed Project and alternatives would require a maximum of 350 workers, with a daily average of 155 personnel (April 2009 to November 2013). Because the maximum number of workers is so low, any worker relocations are expected to be minor and temporary. As a result, construction of the proposed Project would not induce population growth in the Project area beyond existing forecasts.

The following subsections address potential Project-related construction and operation impacts and proposed mitigation measures according to significance criteria established in Appendix G, CEQA Guidelines.

Construction.

Would the Project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Construction of the proposed Project does not involve constructing or proposing new homes and businesses. Relative to the large construction workforce available within the proposed Project region, as indicated in Table 4.13-4, the personnel required for construction of the proposed Project represent a minimal amount of the locally available workforce. In this way, most if not all construction workers are expected to originate from the local labor pool and are not expected to relocate from areas outside of the Project area. Additionally, due to the temporary nature of construction, any non-regional workers would only be expected to remain in the region for the duration of the Project construction. As a result, construction of the proposed Project would not induce population growth in the Project area. Operation of the TRTP also would not induce growth because it is designed to meet existing and forecasted local demand (see Section 7.0 for more discussion). Thus, no significant impacts would be expected and therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Construction of the proposed Project would predominantly take place within existing R-O-W, with a portion requiring R-O-W acquisition. The proposed Project area including acquired R-O-W does not contain habitable housing structures, and would not require removal of housing units. In this way, construction of the proposed Project would not displace existing housing and, therefore, no replacement housing would be needed. There would be no impact related to displaced housing, and no mitigation measures are needed.

Would the Project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

As discussed previously, construction of the proposed Project would utilize the local workforce and would not require substantial relocation of workers from outside the proposed Project region. Additionally, construction of the proposed Project would not involve the displacement of existing houses. As a result, the proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of people. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Operation.

Would the Project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Jurisdictions within the proposed Project area are forecasted to undergo high population and housing growth. This growth however, is expected to occur regardless of the implementation of the proposed Project. As discussed in Section 7.0, Growth-Inducing Impacts, the proposed expansion and upgrade of SCE's transmission system would not induce growth, but rather accommodates existing and forecasted demand. As a result, operation of the proposed transmission system would be anticipated to result in no impact to induce population growth (refer to Section 7.0, Growth Inducing Impacts). No mitigation measures are required.

Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Construction- and operation-related activities of the proposed Project and alternatives would not require removal of housing units. As a result, the proposed Project would have no impact related to displacement of housing. No mitigation measures are needed.

Would the Project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Most if not all of the employees necessary to operate the Segment 4 TRTP would be drawn from SCE's existing workforce and the TRTP would result in no impact related to displacement of substantial numbers of people. No mitigation measures are required.

4.13.6.1.3 Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts to population or housing would occur along Segment 4, therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS
AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

SECTION 4.0

Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project

4.13.6.1.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. There are no potentially significant population and housing impacts from Segment 4.

4.13.6.2 Segment 5

Segment 5 traverses through the unincorporated northern portion of Los Angeles County, the City of Lancaster, and the City of Palmdale.

4.13.6.2.1 Environmental Setting. As previously discussed in the Segment 4 environmental setting (Section 4.13.6.1.1), the County of Los Angeles is characterized by a large regional population and high population growth, and within the County, the City of Lancaster is a rapidly growing municipality.

The City of Palmdale is also undergoing expansive population growth and is projected to surpass the City of Lancaster in rate of growth and total population size. Segment 5 population data and projections are presented in Table 4.13-5.

**TABLE 4.13-5
SEGMENT 5: POPULATION AND PERCENT CHANGE 2000-2030¹**

Jurisdiction	2000	2010	2020	2030	2000-2030 Change (%)
County of Los Angeles	9,519,338	10,718,007	11,501,884	12,221,799	2,702,461 (28.4%)
City of Lancaster	118,718	168,032	215,468	259,696	140,978 (118.8%)
City of Palmdale	116,670	176,506	259,712	337,314	220,644 (189.1%)

¹ Sources: Southern California Association of Governments, 2004; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

As mentioned in Section 4.13.6.1.1, the County of Los Angeles and City of Lancaster have forecast housing growth rates which correspond to projected population increases. As indicated in Table 4.13-6, the City of Palmdale also has a high housing growth rate.

Labor force characteristics of jurisdictions within the Segment 5 Project area are reported in Table 4.13-7. As previously discussed in Section 4.13.6.1.1, the County of Los Angeles has a large labor force. The City of Palmdale has a workforce similar in size to the City of Lancaster, with similar high unemployment rates of 5.8 percent for Palmdale in 2006 and 6.8 percent for Lancaster. Both cities are classified as LSAs in the 2006-2007 list of Labor Surplus Areas.

The local Project-related workforce associated with Segment 5 would be Los Angeles County, which has large labor pools in the Construction (134,500 personnel) and Trade, Transportation, and Utilities (782,700 personnel) industry sectors (Table 4.13-4).

TABLE 4.13-6
SEGMENT 5: HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS: 2000-2030¹

Jurisdiction	Housing Units, 2000	Vacancy Rate, 2000 (%)	Forecasted Housing Units, 2010	Forecasted Housing Units, 2020	Forecasted Housing Units, 2030	2000-2030 Change (%)
County of Los Angeles	3,137,047	137,135 (4.4%)	3,404,016	3,763,875	4,120,270	983,223 (31.3%)
City of Lancaster	38,491	3,473 (9.0%)	54,626	66,591	81,403	42,912 (111.5%)
City of Palmdale	34,447	2,792 (8.1%)	48,628	68,847	88,623	54,176 (157.3%)

¹ Sources: Southern California Association of Governments, 2004; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

TABLE 4.13-7
SEGMENT 5: LABOR FORCE CHARACTERISTICS: 2006¹

Jurisdiction	Labor Force	Employment	Unemployment (Rate, %)
County of Los Angeles	4,860,600	4,613,600	229,000 (4.7%)
City of Lancaster	54,400	50,700	3,700 (6.8%)
City of Palmdale	54,400	51,200	3,200 (5.9%)

¹ Source: 2006 Annual Average, California Labor Market Information, EDD.

4.13.6.2.2 Impact Analysis.

Construction and Operation. From the standpoint of population and housing, the regional setting and project-related characteristics of this segment are similar to those of Segment 4 and no significant impacts are expected. Neither construction nor operation of this segment would be expected to induce population growth, displace housing, or displace populations.

4.13.6.2.3 Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts would occur along Segment 5, therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

4.13.6.2.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. There are no potential population and housing impacts from Segment 5, thus, impacts would be less than significant.

4.13.6.3 Segment 6

Segment 6 traverses through the unincorporated area of Los Angeles County, and the City of Duarte. Segment 6 also traverses Angeles National Forest land. Residences within the

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS
AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

SECTION 4.0

Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project

Angeles National Forest consist of recreation residence uses, for which the Angeles National Forest Land Management Plan specifies “will not be used as a domicile or legal residence. Therefore, it may not be used as a place where the permittee’s domestic activities are centered.” Based on this classification, the CEQA requirements for population and housing analysis do not apply to the Angeles National Forest in this study.

4.13.6.3.1 Environmental Setting. As previously discussed in the Segment 4 environmental setting (Section 4.13.6.1.1), the County of Los Angeles is a region characterized with a large population and high population growth rate. With respect to the County however, the City of Duarte is not characterized with as rapid of a growth as the region. As shown in Table 4.13-8, the City is expected to undergo moderate population growth, with similar projections made for housing growth, as indicated in Table 4.13-9. Additionally, unemployment levels in the City of Duarte are lower than Los Angeles County (see Table 4.13-10).

**TABLE 4.13-8
SEGMENT 6: POPULATION AND PERCENT CHANGE 2000-2030¹**

Jurisdiction	2000	2010	2020	2030	2000-2030 Change (%)
County of Los Angeles	9,519,338	10,718,007	11,501,884	12,221,799	2,702,461 (28.4%)
City of Duarte	21,486	23,110	23,866	24,570	3,084 (14.4%)

¹ Sources: Southern California Association of Governments, 2004; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

**TABLE 4.13-9
SEGMENT 6: HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS: 2000-2030¹**

Jurisdiction	Housing Units, 2000	Vacancy Rate, 2000	Forecasted Housing Units, 2010	Forecasted Housing Units, 2020	Forecasted Housing Units, 2030	2000-2030 Change (%)
County of Los Angeles	3,137,047	137,135 (4.4%)	3,404,016	3,763,875	4,120,270	983,223 (31.3%)
City of Duarte	6,637	170 (2.6%)	7,057	7,458	7,861	1,224 (18.4%)

¹ Sources: Southern California Association of Governments, 2004; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

**TABLE 4.13-10
SEGMENT 6: LABOR FORCE CHARACTERISTICS: 2006¹**

Jurisdiction	Labor Force, 2006	Employment, 2006	Unemployment (Rate, %), 2006
County of Los Angeles	4,860,600	4,613,600	229,000 (4.7%)
City of Duarte	11,400	11,100	300 (2.6%)

¹ Source: 2006 Annual Average, California Labor Market Information, EDD.

4.13.6.3.2 Impact Analysis.

Construction and Operation. From the standpoint of population and housing, the environmental setting and project-related characteristics of this segment are similar to those of Segment 4, and impacts are expected to be equivalent; that is, neither construction nor operation of this segment would be expected to induce population growth, displace housing, or displace populations. No significant impacts to population or housing would occur.

4.13.6.3.3 Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts would occur along Segment 6; therefore, mitigation measures are not necessary.

4.13.6.3.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. Potential significant population and housing impacts for Segment 6 would be less than significant.

4.13.6.4 Segment 7

Segment 7 consists of the proposed Project area traversing through: the cities of Duarte, Irwindale, South El Monte, Baldwin Park, and Industry; the unincorporated County of Los Angeles community Avocado Heights; and the cities of Montebello and Monterey Park.

4.13.6.4.1 Environmental Setting. Population and housing characteristics for jurisdictions located within the Segment 7 Project area are presented in Tables 4.13-11 and 4.13-12, respectively. Jurisdictions within the Segment 7 Project area generally reflect areas of moderate to high growth in population and housing. Notable variances are the City of Irwindale, which is expected to have the highest population growth, and the City of Industry, which is expected to have the lowest population growth rate of jurisdictions within the Segment 7 Project area.

As shown in Table 4.13-13, labor force characteristics of the jurisdictions located in Segment 7 are comparatively similar in workforce size, with exception of the cities of Irwindale, and Industry. Similarly the jurisdictions have comparable unemployment rates. Within the Segment 7 Project area, the City of Montebello has been identified as an LSA in the 2006-2007 list of Labor Surplus Areas.

4.13.6.4.2 Impact Analysis.

Construction and Operation. From the standpoint of population and housing, the regional setting and project-related characteristics of this segment are similar to those of Segment 4. That is, neither construction nor operation of this segment would be expected to induce population growth, displace housing, or displace populations. No significant impacts are expected.

SECTION 4.0

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS
AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project

**TABLE 4.13-11
SEGMENT 7: POPULATION AND PERCENT CHANGE 2000-2030¹**

Jurisdiction	2000	2010	2020	2030	2000-2030 Change (%)
City of Duarte	21,486	23,110	23,866	24,570	3,084 (14.4%)
City of Irwindale	1,446	1,809	2,358	2,871	1,425 (98.5%)
City of South El Monte	21,144	22,559	23,438	24,256	3,112 (14.7%)
City of Baldwin Park	75,837	86,367	88,880	91,219	15,382 (20.3%)
City of Industry	777	799	799	799	22 (2.8%)
Community of Avocado Heights	15,148	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
City of Monterey Park	60,051	70,072	80,917	91,027	30,976 (51.6%)
City of Montebello	62,150	66,020	68,102	70,046	7,896 (12.7%)

¹ Sources: Southern California Association of Governments, 2004; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

**TABLE 4.13-12
SEGMENT 7: HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS: 2000-2030¹**

Jurisdiction	Housing Units, 2000	Vacancy Rate, 2000	Forecasted Housing Units, 2010	Forecasted Housing Units, 2020	Forecasted Housing Units, 2030	2000-2030 Change (%)
City of Duarte	6,637	170 (2.6%)	7,057	7,458	7,861	1,224 (18.4%)
City of Irwindale	365	13 (3.6%)	394	502	607	242 (66.3%)
City of South El Monte	4,620	97 (2.1%)	4,776	5,059	5,342	722 (15.6%)
City of Baldwin Park	16,991	467 (2.7%)	18,673	19,324	19,994	3,003 (17.7%)
City of Industry	121	0 (0%)	121	121	122	1 (0.1%)
Community of Avocado Heights	3,833	8 (2.0%)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
City of Monterey Park	19,626	646 (3.3%)	20,177	22,214	24,236	4,610 (23.5%)
City of Montebello	18,833	580 (3.1%)	19,398	20,702	22,009	3,176 (16.9%)

¹ Sources: Southern California Association of Governments, 2004; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

4.13.6.4.3 Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts would occur along Segment 7, therefore, mitigation measures are not necessary.

4.13.6.4.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. There would be no potentially significant population and housing impacts associated with construction and operation of Segment 7.

TABLE 4.13-13
SEGMENT 7: LABOR FORCE CHARACTERISTICS: 2006¹

Jurisdiction	Labor Force	Employment	Unemployment (Rate, %)
City of Duarte	11,400	11,100	300 (2.6%)
City of Irwindale	700	700	0 (0%)
City of South El Monte	9,200	8,700	500 (5.4%)
City of Baldwin Park	32,800	30,800	2,000 (6.1%)
City of Industry	300	300	0 (0%)
Community of Avocado Heights	6,700	6,400	300 (4.5%)
City of Monterey Park	29,600	28,600	1,000 (3.4%)
City of Montebello	20,700	19,800	900 (4.3%)

¹ Source: 2006 Annual Average, California Labor Market Information, EDD.

4.13.6.5 Segment 8

The Segment 8 area of the proposed Project would traverse through: the cities of Monterey Park, Montebello, Pico Rivera, and Industry; the community of Hacienda Heights (unincorporated community of Los Angeles County); the City of La Habra Heights; the community of Rowland Heights; and the cities of Whittier, Chino Hills, Chino, and Ontario.

Segment 8 of the proposed Project also traverses federal Department of Defense (DoD) land which does not contain residential housing. For this reason, the DoD jurisdiction is not addressed further in this analysis.

4.13.6.5.1 Environmental Setting. The Segment 8 Project area is generally an area of high population and housing growth, as indicated in Table 4.13-14 (Population and Percent Change 2000-2030) and Table 4.13-15 (Housing Characteristics: 2000-2030). The main exception is the City of Industry, which has a small population with a small projected population growth. Additionally, the cities of Montebello and Whittier exhibit comparatively modest levels of growth in population and housing. Conversely, the City of Ontario, which has the highest population of cities within the Segment 8 Project area, displays the highest forecasted population growth (93.4 percent) and housing development (107.7 percent).

Table 4.13-16 provides labor force data for jurisdictions located within the Segment 8 Project area. As shown, the size of the area's labor force is consistent with the population size, and the unemployment setting similarly compares with the regional unemployment rate (4.7 percent). As mentioned previously in Section 4.13.6.4, the City of Montebello has been identified as an LSA.

TABLE 4.13-14
SEGMENT 8: POPULATION AND PERCENT CHANGE 2000-2030¹

Jurisdiction	2000	2010	2020	2030	2000-2030 Change (%)
City of Monterey Park	60,051	70,072	80,917	91,027	30,976 (51.6%)
City of Montebello	62,150	66,020	68,102	70,046	7,896 (12.7%)
City of Pico Rivera	63,428	67,523	71,231	74,687	11,259 (17.8%)
City of Industry	777	799	799	799	22 (2.8%)
Community of Hacienda Heights	53,122	n/a ²	n/a	n/a	n/a
City of La Habra Heights	5,712	6,631	7,950	9,181	3,469 (60.7%)
Community of Rowland Heights	48,553	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
City of Whittier	83,680	88,085	91,049	93,814	10,134 (12.1%)
City of Chino Hills	66,787	78,307	81,916	85,284	18,497 (27.7%)
City of Chino	67,168	82,319	98,703	113,977	46,809 (69.7%)
City of Ontario	158,007	180,059	244,977	305,509	147,502 (93.4%)

¹ Sources: Southern California Association of Governments, 2004; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

² n/a: Data not available.

4.13.6.5.2 Impact Analysis.

Construction and Operation. From the standpoint of population and housing, the regional setting and project-related characteristics of this segment are similar to those of Segment 4, and impacts are expected to be equivalent; that is, neither construction nor operation of this segment would be expected to induce population growth, displace housing, or displace populations. No significant impacts would be expected to occur.

4.13.6.5.3 Mitigation Measures. As no significant impacts would occur along Segment 8, no mitigation measures are necessary.

4.13.6.5.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. There are no potentially significant population and housing impacts from construction and operation of Segment 8.

4.13.6.6 Segment 9

Segment 9 involves the construction and operation of new or expanded substation facilities in unincorporated areas of Kern and Los Angeles counties and upgrades to existing substations in the cities of La Cañada Flintridge, Lancaster, and Monterey Park.

SECTION 4.0

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS
AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project

**TABLE 4.13-15
SEGMENT 8: HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS: 2000-2030¹**

Jurisdiction	Housing Units, 2000	Vacancy Rate, 2000	Forecasted Housing Units, 2010	Forecasted Housing Units, 2020	Forecasted Housing Units, 2030	2000-2030 Change (%)
City of Monterey Park	19,626	646 (3.3%)	20,177	22,214	24,236	4,610 (23.5%)
City of Montebello	18,833	580 (3.1%)	19,398	20,702	22,009	3,176 (16.9%)
City of Pico Rivera	16,468	334 (2.0%)	17,301	18,534	19,763	3,295 (20.0%)
City of Industry	121	0 (0%)	121	121	122	1 (0.1%)
Community of Hacienda Heights	16,356	364 (2.2%)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
City of La Habra Heights	1,890	72 (3.8%)	2,204	2,635	3,059	1,169 (61.9%)
Community of Rowland Heights	14,548	367 (2.5%)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
City of Whittier	28,270	707 (2.5%)	29,311	10,776	32,250	3,980 (14.1%)
City of Chino Hills	20,158	374 (1.9%)	22,466	24,779	27,252	7,094 (35.2%)
City of Chino	17,331	631 (3.6%)	20,818	26,451	32,202	14,871 (85.8%)
City of Ontario	43,538	1,671 (3.8%)	48,749	69,473	90,417	46,879 (107.7%)

¹ Sources: Southern California Association of Governments, 2007; U.S. Census Bureau.

² n/a = not available.

**TABLE 4.13-16
SEGMENT 8: LABOR FORCE CHARACTERISTICS: 2006¹**

Jurisdiction	Labor Force	Employment	Unemployment (Rate, %)
City of Monterey Park	29,600	28,600	1,000 (3.4%)
City of Montebello	20,700	19,800	900 (4.3%)
City of Pico Rivera	29,000	27,700	1,300 (4.5%)
City of Industry	300	300	0 (0%)
Community of Hacienda Heights	27,400	26,500	900 (3.3%)
City of La Habra Heights	2,900	2,900	0 (0%)
Community of Rowland Heights	25,500	24,700	800 (3.1%)
City of Whittier	44,000	42,500	1,500 (3.4%)
City of Chino Hills	42,300	41,300	1,000 (2.4%)
City of Chino	35,900	34,400	1,500 (4.2%)
City of Ontario	83,800	79,600	4,200 (5.0%)

¹ Source: 2006 Annual Average, California Labor Market Information, EDD.

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS
AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

SECTION 4.0

Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project

4.13.6.6.1 Environmental Setting. Refer to Section 4.13.1.1 for discussions of the population, housing, and environmental settings for Kern County, Los Angeles County, and the City of Lancaster, and Section 4.13.6.4 for the City of Monterey Park. As shown in Tables 4.13-17 and 4.13-18, the City of La Cañada Flintridge displays a smaller population and population growth rate with a corresponding housing growth rate as compared with the other jurisdictions within Segment 9. In contrast with the Kern County, Los Angeles County, and the City of Lancaster, the City of La Cañada Flintridge has a low unemployment rate, as indicated in Table 4.13-19. The City of La Cañada Flintridge is characterized as a municipality with conservative growth relative to the region.

**TABLE 4.13-17
SEGMENT 9: POPULATION AND PERCENT CHANGE 2000-2030¹**

Jurisdiction	2000	2010	2020	2030	2000-2030 Change (%)
County of Kern	661,645	808,808	950,112	1,114,878	453,233 (68.5%)
County of Los Angeles	9,519,338	10,718,007	11,501,884	12,221,799	2,702,461 (28.4%)
City of La Cañada Flintridge	20,318	21,340	21,456	21,562	1,244 (6.1%)
City of Lancaster	118,718	168,032	215,468	259,696	140,978 (118.8%)
City of Monterey Park	60,051	70,072	80,917	91,027	30,976 (51.6%)

¹ Sources: Southern California Association of Governments, 2004; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

**TABLE 4.13-18
SEGMENT 9: HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS: 2000-2030¹**

Jurisdiction	Housing Units, 2000	Vacancy Rate, 2000	Forecasted Housing Units, 2010	Forecasted Housing Units, 2020	Forecasted Housing Units, 2030	2000-2030 Change (%)
County of Kern	231,567	22,912 (9.9%)	278,899	327,625	384,441	152,874 (66.0%)
County of Los Angeles	3,137,047	137,135 (4.4%)	3,404,016	3,763,875	4,120,270	983,223 (31.3%)
City of La Cañada Flintridge	6,828	171 (2.5%)	6,902	7,120	7,345	517 (7.6%)
City of Lancaster	38,289	3,473 (9.1%)	51,418	66,591	81,403	43,114 (112.6%)
City of Monterey Park	19,626	646 (3.3%)	20,177	22,214	24,236	4,610 (23.5%)

¹ Sources: Southern California Association of Governments, 2004; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

4.13.6.6.2 Impact Analysis.

Construction and Operation. From the standpoint of population and housing, the regional setting and project-related characteristics of this segment are similar to those of Segment 4.

TABLE 4.13-19
SEGMENT 9: LABOR FORCE CHARACTERISTICS: 2006¹

Jurisdiction	Labor Force	Employment	Unemployment (Rate, %)
County of Kern	338,400	312,800	25,600 (7.6%)
County of Los Angeles	4,860,600	4,613,600	229,000 (4.7%)
City of La Cañada Flintridge	10,600	10,400	200 (1.9%)
City of Lancaster	54,400	50,700	3,700 (6.8%)
City of Monterey Park	29,600	28,600	1,000 (3.4%)

¹ Source: 2006 Annual Average, California Labor Market Information, EDD.

Neither construction nor operation of this segment is expected to induce population growth, displace housing, or displace populations. No significant impacts would be expected to occur.

4.13.6.6.3 Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts would result from Segment 9 construction and operation activities, therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

4.13.6.6.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. The potential impacts to population and housing levels from Segment 9 construction and operation are considered to be less than significant.

4.13.6.7 Segment 10

Segment 10 consists of the proposed Project area, and alternatives, traversing through an unincorporated area in southern Kern County.

4.13.6.7.1 Environmental Setting. The population, housing, and employment setting in Kern County is described in Section 4.13.6.1.1, with relevant data summarized in Tables 4.13-1 through 4.13-3.

4.13.6.7.2 Impact Analysis.

Construction and Operation. From the standpoint of population and housing, the environmental setting and project-related characteristics of this segment are similar to those of Segment 4, and impacts are expected to be equivalent; that is, neither construction nor operation of this segment would be expected to induce population growth, displace housing, or displace populations. No significant impacts would be expected to occur.

4.13.6.7.3 Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts would occur along Segment 10; therefore, mitigation measures are not necessary.

4.13.6.7.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. The potential impacts to population and housing associated with construction and operation of Segment 10 are considered to be less than significant.

4.13.6.8 Segment 11

From north to south, Segment 11 traverses through the unincorporated community of Acton, the cities of La Cañada Flintridge and Pasadena, the unincorporated community of East Pasadena, the unincorporated community of Altadena, the cities of Temple City and San Gabriel, the unincorporated communities of East San Gabriel and South San Gabriel, and the cities of Rosemead and Monterey Park.

Segment 11 also traverses Angeles National Forest land. Residences within the Angeles National Forest are for recreational use only, which the Angeles National Forest Land Management Plan specifies “will not be used as a domicile or legal residence. Therefore, it may not be used as a place where the permittee’s domestic activities are centered.” Based on this classification, the CEQA requirements for population and housing analysis do not apply to the Angeles National Forest in this study.

4.13.6.8.1 Environmental Setting. Segment 11 is located entirely in Los Angeles County. As previously stated, Los Angeles County is a region characterized with high population levels and growth. Table 4.13-20 presents existing and forecasted population characteristics for the jurisdictions within the Segment 11 Project area. As shown, with the exception of the City of La Cañada Flintridge, the municipalities within the Segment 11 Project area are forecasted to experience comparatively high population growth. While population projections are not available for the unincorporated communities of Acton, East Pasadena, Altadena, East San Gabriel, and South San Gabriel, based on County trends and their proximity to adjacent cities with forecasted high population growth, the unincorporated communities may be reasonably expected to undergo population growth as well.

Consistent with the high population growth rates, high growth rates for housing (Table 4.13-21) are also predicted. With the exception Monterey Park, forecast growth in housing units is greater than the forecast population growth. The simultaneous high population and housing growth rate projections are indicative of continuing regional expansion and development.

Table 4.13-22 provides labor force data for the Segment 11 jurisdictions based on the California Labor Market Division. As indicated, the cities and communities have unemployment rates generally similar to the County rate (4.7 percent).

SECTION 4.0

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS
AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project

**TABLE 4.13-20
SEGMENT 11: POPULATION AND PERCENT CHANGE 2000-2030¹**

Jurisdiction	2000	2010	2020	2030	2000-2030 Change (%)
City of La Cañada Flintridge	20,318	21,340	21,340	21,562	1,244 (6.1%)
City of Pasadena	133,936	146,489	159,242	171,138	37,202 (27.8%)
Community of East Pasadena	6,045	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Community of Altadena	42,610	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
City of San Gabriel	39,804	45,346	50,127	54,585	14,781 (37.1%)
Community of East San Gabriel	14,512	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Community of South San Gabriel	7,595	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
City of Rosemead	53,505	57,750	60,806	63,651	10,146 (19.0%)
City of Monterey Park	60,051	70,072	80,917	91,027	30,976 (51.6%)

¹ Sources: Southern California Association of Governments, 2004; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

**TABLE 4.13-21
SEGMENT 11: HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS: 2000-2030¹**

Jurisdiction	Housing Units, 2000	Vacancy Rate, 2000	Forecasted Housing Units, 2010	Forecasted Housing Units, 2020	Forecasted Housing Units, 2030	2000-2030 Change (%)
Community of Acton	717	0 (0%)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
City of La Cañada Flintridge	6,828	171 (2.5%)	6,902	7,120	7,345	517 (7.6%)
City of Pasadena	51,842	2,287 (4.4%)	55,242	61,260	67,227	15,385 (29.7%)
Community of East Pasadena	2,123	88 (4.1%)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Community of Altadena	15,245	470 (3.1%)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
City of San Gabriel	12,592	317 (2.5%)	13,774	15,510	17,231	4,639 (36.8%)
Community of East San Gabriel	5,387	186 (3.5%)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Community of South San Gabriel	5,387	75 (1.4%)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
City of Rosemead	13,948	425 (3.0%)	14,519	15,746	16,967	3,019 (21.6%)
City of Monterey Park	19,626	646 (3.3%)	20,177	22,214	24,236	4,610 (23.5%)

¹ Sources: Southern California Association of Governments, 2004; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

TABLE 4.13-22
SEGMENT 11: EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS¹

Jurisdiction	Labor Force	Employment	Unemployment (Rate, %)
Community of Acton	1,200	1,200	0 (0%)
City of Cañada Flintridge	10,600	10,400	200 (1.9%)
Community of Hacienda Heights	27,400	26,500	900 (3.3%)
City of Pasadena	76,600	73,900	2,700 (3.5%)
Community of East Pasadena	3,300	3,200	100 (3.0%)
Community of Altadena	24,200	23,400	800 (3.3%)
City of Temple City	18,300	17,800	500 (2.7%)
City of San Gabriel	20,700	19,900	800 (3.9%)
Community of East San Gabriel	8,200	8,000	200 (2.4%)
Community of South San Gabriel	3,800	3,600	200 (5.3%)
City of Rosemead	24,900	23,900	1,000 (4.0%)
City of Monterey Park	29,600	28,600	1,000 (3.4%)

¹ Source: 2006 Annual Average, California Labor Market Information, EDD.

Table 4.13-4 provides major industry sector data for the Segment 11 area, which would be included in the Los Angeles County region. As noted earlier, existing construction and utilities related workforces in Los Angeles County are large and predicted to experience continued growth (see Table 4.13-4).

4.13.6.8.2 Impact Analysis.

Construction and Operation. From the standpoint of population and housing, the regional setting and project-related characteristics of Segment 11 are similar to those of Segment 4, and impacts are expected to be equivalent; that is, neither construction nor operation of this segment would be expected to induce population growth, displace housing, or displace populations. No significant impacts would be expected to occur.

4.13.6.8.3 Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts would occur along Segment 11, therefore, mitigation measures are not necessary.

4.13.6.8.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. There would be no potentially significant impacts to population and housing associated with construction and operation of Segment 11.

4.13.7 References

Angeles National Forest Land Management Plan. 2003.

California Department of Finance. 2006. California Cities and Counties Rankings.

California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division. 2003. Industry Employment Projections, 2002-2012. Kern County.

2003. Industry Employment Projections, 2002-2012. Los Angeles County.

2003. Industry Employment Projections, 2002-2012. Riverside-San Bernardino Counties.

Kern Council of Governments (Kern COG). 2007. <http://www.kerncog.org>.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2004. RTP Growth Forecast. <http://www.scag.ca.gov/forecast/downloads/2004GF.xls>.

2006. The State of the Region.

2007. <http://www.scag.ca.gov>.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. Census 2000 Summary file (SF 2), Total Population.

2000. Census 2000 Summary File (SF 3), Physical Housing Characteristics.

2000. Census 2000 Summary File (SF 3), Vacant Housing Units.

2007. Table 1: Population Estimates for the 100 U.S. Counties with the Largest Numerical Increase from April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2006.

This page left intentionally blank.