

6.10 SOCIOECONOMICS

The socioeconomic section describes the potential impact to the social and economic structure within the project vicinity and region resulting from the Canyon Power Plant (CPP) construction and operation. This discussion considers issues in project-related impacts to population, housing, public services (fire protection, emergency response services, law enforcement, schools, libraries, and medical services) and utilities, county tax revenue, and economic benefits from the project. Additionally, this section includes the cumulative impacts on the availability of labor within the area. Permits required for the project, proposed mitigation measures, laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS), and agency contacts relevant to socioeconomics are also discussed in this section.

The Canyon Power Plant (CPP) will consist of a nominal 200-megawatt (MW) simple-cycle plant, using four natural gas-fired General Electric LM 6000PC Sprint combustion turbines and associated infrastructure. The project site is located at 3071 East Miraloma Avenue, in a City of Anaheim (COA)-designated industrial zone.

The CPP and associated construction laydown areas will be located on approximately 10 acres of disturbed land located at 3071 East Miraloma Avenue. Main access to the CPP site will be at the southeast corner of the project site from East Miraloma Avenue. A second gated entrance will be accessible via East Miraloma Avenue with a third gate off the alley to the east of the site. (Total land disturbance will be approximately 10 acres.)

The existing CPP site is predominantly paved (concrete and asphalt). Principal land use for the site was food catering for a fleet of approximately 75 to 100 trucks, formerly operated by Orange County Food Service. Onsite structures include a kitchen/warehouse building, maintenance garage (9 service bays), truck wash facility (5 bays), two ice manufacturing buildings, several storage sheds, and an outdoor truck repair shop which includes storage lockers and petroleum products, all of which will be demolished as a part of the CPP project.

The following activities are not part of the CPP project:

- Three residential houses along East Miraloma Avenue have recently been removed and are not a part of this Application for Certification (AFC). The COA Risk Manager and Fire Department determined that the residential units posed security and fire risks, and therefore they were removed. A letter from the COA Risk Manager to the Public Utilities Department is included in Appendix Q.
- Soil remediation activities associated with Phase I, Phase II, and Supplemental Phase II reports. The COA, now as owner of the property, has determined that it will conduct any soil remediation activities to limit its environmental liability for future uses of the site. These activities will occur regardless of whether the CPP project obtains a CEC license.

- Installation of a temporary, 8-foot-high security fence around the perimeter of the entire 10-acre site.
- General maintenance activities including site cleanup and trash removal.

The project will include the construction and/or installation of the following components:

- **Proposed CPP site.** In addition to the four natural gas-fired GE LM 6000PC Sprint gas turbines, the plant will include generator step-up transformers (GSUs), a 69 kilovolt (kV) switchyard, onsite fuel gas compressors, a gas pressure control and metering station, a packaged chilled water system for combustion turbine engine (CTG) power augmentation with associated heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC)-type four-cell cooling tower, selective catalytic reduction system (SCR) emission control systems, and other associated plant infrastructure.
- **Gas Pipeline.** Natural gas will be provided via a new 3,240-foot-long, 12-inch, 350 pounds per square inch gauge (psig) gas line owned and maintained by SoCal Gas Company (SCGC), which will be connected to new onsite fuel gas compressors that will be part of the CPP facility. From the CPP site, this new pipeline will run approximately 580 feet east in East Miraloma Avenue to Kraemer Boulevard, then north 2,660 feet in Kraemer Boulevard to East Orangethorpe Avenue to connect into SCGC's transmission line L-1218 in East Orangethorpe Avenue. (Total land disturbance will be 0.219 acre.)
- **Process water.** Process water for the project will be recycled water supplied from the Orange County groundwater replenishment system (GWRS) via a new 2,185-foot-long, 14-inch pipeline utilizing a new offsite booster pump station. The water pipeline will run east of the site on the north side of East Miraloma Avenue for 1,850 feet to the new pumping station located north of the curb in the COA-owned easement of East Miraloma Avenue, then north 210 feet in new easement from the Orange County Water District (OCWD), then 125 feet easterly in new easement to the GWRS line on the western side of the Carbon Canyon Diversion Channel. There, it will connect to the 60-inch-diameter GWRS recycled water line at an existing 36-inch stub up. (Total land disturbance for both line and pumping station will be 0.246 acre.)
- **Electrical interconnection.** Underground 69 kV cables will connect from GSUs to the onsite switchyard, which will use gas-insulated switchgear (GIS). There will be four new underground 69 kV circuits leaving the site. Two will proceed underneath and to the south side of East Miraloma Avenue approximately 100 feet to rise up and connect to the existing 69 kV overhead Vermont-Yorba lines via two new transition structures. The second two 69 kV underground circuits will proceed eastward approximately 4,000 feet in East Miraloma Avenue, turn south on Miller, then proceed approximately 3,000 feet to connect to the Dowling-Yorba 69 kV line at East La Palma Avenue. (Total land disturbance for both sets of cables will be 0.489 acre.)

- **Communications.** Fiber optic cable will run in a common trench with the approximately 7,000-foot 69 kV electric cables, where it will tie into existing underground fiber optic cable for the supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) system.

6.10.1 Affected Environment

6.10.1.1 Study Area

The proposed project includes the construction and operation of a generating facility located at 3071 East Miraloma Avenue in the COA, Orange County. The project site is within 1 mile of both State Route (SR) 91 which lies to the south and SR 57 which is located to the west.

Orange County is located along 42 miles of the Southern California coast, with Los Angeles County situated to the north, San Diego County bordering on the south, and Riverside and San Bernardino counties located to the east. Incorporated cities in Orange County are generally located in the northwest area, and stretch south along the coast. The County has an extensive freeway system which connects labor force and employment centers with Los Angeles County.

This section will describe existing and future (i.e., during operation of the proposed project) economic and demographic conditions at the following geographic resolutions. The socioeconomic study area pertaining to population and housing include the COA and the counties of Orange, Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino. The project area pertaining to regional workforce and indirect and induced economic impacts for the proposed project consist of Orange, Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. The environmental justice analysis evaluates the demographics and poverty for the population located within a 6-mile radius of the site.

6.10.1.2 Population, Housing, Economic Base, and Employment

6.10.1.2.1 Population. Historical and projected population data are summarized in Table 6.10-1, which consist of data from the U.S. Census and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The COA experienced a large growth (27.3 percent) over 10 years, and since, has been increasing steadily at a slower pace. Orange County has similarly undergone steady population growth, and has reflected the State's overall trend. Percentage-wise, Los Angeles County does not indicate rapid growth; however, numerically Los Angeles County demonstrates significant additions to its existing large population. San Bernardino County has experienced and will continue to undergo rapid population increases. Riverside County has demonstrated the most aggressive population growth rate, compared with the other counties, and from 1990, is projected to increase by 126.0 percent in 2020.

TABLE 6.10-1
HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED POPULATIONS IN PROJECT AREA, COUNTY
REGION, AND STATE

Area	Population, 1990	Population, 2000	Population, 2005	Projected Population, 2010	Projected Population, 2020	Forecasted 30-Year Growth
City of Anaheim	266,406	330,100	352,032	365,495	377,118	110,712 (41.6%)
Orange County ¹	2,410,556	2,846,289	3,103,377	3,291,628	3,433,609	1,023,053 (42.4%)
Los Angeles County	8,863,164	9,519,338	10,258,304	10,718,007	11,501,884	2,638,720 (29.8%)
Riverside County	1,170,413	1,545,387	1,850,231	2,085,432	2,644,278	1,473,865 (126.0%)
San Bernardino County	1,418,380	1,709,434	1,919,215	2,059,420	2,397,709	979,329 (69.0%)
California ¹	29,760,021	33,871,648	35,893,799	38,067,134	42,206,743	12,446,722 (41.8%)

Sources:

- ¹ Southern California Association of Governments, 2007.
U.S. Census Bureau, 2007.

6.10.1.2.2 Housing. As of January 1, 2007, the housing stock for the COA was 101,510 units. Orange County consisted of 1,024,692 units, Los Angeles County totaled 3,382,356 units, Riverside comprised of 753,797 units, and San Bernardino County consisted of 676,909 units (California Department of Finance, 2007), as shown in Table 6.10-2. These totals include single-family, multi-family, and mobile home residences. Vacancy rates in the COA and the four counties range from 2.76 percent in the COA to 13.36 percent in the County of Riverside. The California Department of Housing and Community Development estimates that a 3 to 5 percent vacancy rate generally indicates a balance between the supply and demand of housing. By this standard, the COA's vacancy rate indicates a potentially short supply of housing in the city, while Orange County and Los Angeles County vacancy rates indicate a balance between the supply and demand of housing. In contrast, Riverside and San Bernardino counties have very high vacancy rates; San Bernardino County's rate is almost double the State average of 5.92 percent, and Riverside County is more than twice the state average. The high vacancy rates indicate that housing availability within these counties is relatively high.

As of 2006, the median prices of existing homes sold in 2006 were \$676,000 in Orange County; \$574,100 in Los Angeles County; \$414,000 in Riverside County; and \$378,100 in San Bernardino County (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007).

**TABLE 6.10-2
2007 HOUSING IN PROJECT AREA, COUNTY REGION, AND STATE**

Jurisdiction	Total Units	Single Family	Multi-Family	Mobile Homes	Percent Vacancy
City of Anaheim	101,510	52,727	44,398	4,385	2.76
Orange County	1,024,692	646,176	346,419	32,097	3.53
Los Angeles County	3,382,356	1,882,499	1,443,156	56,701	4.21
Riverside County	753,797	544,653	123,117	86,027	13.36
San Bernardino County	676,909	504,896	127,784	44,229	11.71
California	13,312,456	8,603,213	4,117,587	591,656	5.92

Source: California Department of Finance, 2007.

The project region is located in a large, developed, metropolitan area. Because of the significant tourism in the region, in particular in Orange and Los Angeles counties, the project region and vicinity has numerous hotel and motel lodgings. In 2007, Orange County had at least 599 hotels and motels at an average 27.1 percent vacancy rate (2007 Southern California Lodging Forecast) and Los Angeles County had 2,417 lodgings at an average 23.1 percent vacancy (Los Angeles Convention and Visitors Bureau). Riverside County had 703 hotels and motels and San Bernardino County had 673 lodgings. In 2007, the Inland Empire, which consists of Riverside and San Bernardino counties, averaged a 29.4 percent vacancy rate (2007 Southern California Lodging Forecast).

6.10.1.2.3 Economic Base and Employment. Orange County's relative employment by industry is shown in Table 6.10-3. In 2004, the top industries by percentage employment were Trade, Transportation, and Utilities; Professional and Business Services; and Manufacturing; with Leisure and Hospitality following. Based on a 10-year projection, the fastest growing industry sectors based on annual average growth rates are Leisure and Hospitality, Professional and Business Services, and Government, followed closely by Construction. Decreases were shown in agriculture (Farm), and no growth was forecasted in Natural Resources and Mining (EDD, 2007).

Orange County is generally wealthier with respect to State averages. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Orange County's mean household income in 2006 was \$94,601, while the State averaged \$77,386. The percentage of the population earning below the poverty threshold was 9.7 percent, whereas California was rated at 13.1 percent (American Community Survey, 2006). Additionally, as presented in Table 6.10-4, Orange County has unemployment rates generally lower than the State, averaging nearly 2 percentage points less since 1990 (EDD, 2007). The California Employment Development Department was contacted to determine unemployment rates for the coming years. These rates have not been

**TABLE 6.10-3
ORANGE COUNTY EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY, 2004-2014**

Industry Sector ¹	Employment/Percent of Industry, 2004	Employment/Percent of Industry, 2014	10-Year Growth Relative to Sector
Total Farm	6,700 (0.5%)	6,600 (0.4%)	-100 (-1.5%)
Construction	92,200 (6.3%)	111,700 (6.4%)	19,500 (21.1%)
Education and Health Services	131,000 (9.0%)	157,900 (9.1%)	26,900 (20.5%)
Financial Activities	132,300 (9.0%)	155,300 (8.9%)	23,000 (17.4%)
Government	153,400 (10.5%)	185,900 (10.7%)	32,500 (21.2%)
Information	33,800 (2.3%)	38,200 (2.2%)	4,400 (13.0%)
Leisure and Hospitality	162,900 (11.1%)	204,200 (11.7%)	41,300 (25.4%)
Manufacturing	183,500 (12.5%)	192,800 (11.1%)	9,300 (5.1%)
Natural Resources and Mining	600 (0.04%)	600 (0.03%)	0
Professional and Business Services	254,900 (17.4%)	316,200 (18.2%)	61,300 (24.0%)
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	264,900 (18.1%)	313,700 (18.0%)	48,800 (18.4%)
Other Services	47,400 (3.2%)	56,100 (3.2%)	8,700 (18.4%)
Orange County Total Employment	1,463,400	1,739,100	275,700 (18.8%)

Source: State of California, Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division, 2007.

¹ Excludes: 1) Unincorporated self-employed. (The estimated and projected employment numbers include all workers who are primarily self-employed and wage and salary workers who hold a secondary job as a self-employed worker.) 2) Unpaid family workers, who are those persons who work without pay for 15 or more hours per week on a farm or in a business operated by a member of the household to whom they are related by birth or marriage.

**TABLE 6.10-4
UNEMPLOYMENT RATES FOR ORANGE, LOS ANGELES,
RIVERSIDE, AND SAN BERNARDINO COUNTIES AND CALIFORNIA**

Region	Unemployment (%)				
	1990	1995	2000	2005	2006
Orange County	3.5	5.1	3.5	3.8	3.4
Los Angeles County	5.8	8.0	5.4	5.3	4.7
Riverside County	7.2	9.5	5.4	5.4	5.0
San Bernardino County	5.6	7.9	4.8	5.2	4.7
California	5.8	7.9	4.9	5.4	4.9

Source: State of California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division, 2007.

forecasted, but are expected to follow the historical unemployment trend shown in Table 6.10-4.

Los Angeles County has the largest employment base in the project region. As shown in Table 6.10-5, top industries in 2004 were Trade, Transportation, and Utilities; Government; Professional and Business Services; and Manufacturing. Based on 10-year projections, the fastest growing industries for 2014 are Education and Health Services; Professional and Business Services; and Leisure and Hospitality; followed by Trade, Transportation, and Utilities. Decreases are forecasted for Manufacturing, Farm, and Natural Resources and Mining (EDD, 2007).

**TABLE 6.10-5
LOS ANGELES COUNTY EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY, 2004-2014**

Industry Sector	Employment/Percent of Industry ¹ , 2004	Employment/Percent of Industry ¹ , 2014	10-Year Growth Relative to Sector
Total Farm	7,600 (0.2%)	7,100 (0.2%)	-500 (-6.6%)
Construction	140,200 (3.5%)	151,400 (3.4%)	11,200 (8.0%)
Education and Health Services	467,000 (11.7%)	584,500 (13.1%)	117,500 (25.2%)
Financial Activities	241,600 (6.0%)	264,300 (5.9%)	22,700 (9.4%)
Government	587,100 (14.7%)	636,100 (14.3%)	49,000 (8.3%)
Information	211,900 (5.3%)	233,900 (5.3%)	22,000 (10.4%)
Leisure and Hospitality	372,800 (9.3%)	440,800 (9.9%)	68,000 (18.2%)
Manufacturing	483,600 (12.1%)	425,000 (9.5%)	-58,000 (-12.1%)
Natural Resources and Mining	3,800 (0.1%)	3,700 (0.1%)	-100 (-2.6%)
Professional and Business Services	562,400 (14.1%)	665,500 (14.9%)	103,100 (18.3%)
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	781,600 (19.5%)	883,400 (19.8%)	101,800 (13.0%)
Other Services	144,700 (3.6%)	158,200 (3.6%)	13,500 (9.3%)
Los Angeles County Total Employment	4,004,100	4,453,900	449,800 (11.2%)

Source: State of California, Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division, 2007.

¹ Excludes: 1) Unincorporated self-employed. (The estimated and projected employment numbers includes all workers who are primarily self-employed and wage and salary workers who hold a secondary job as a self-employed worker.) 2) Unpaid family workers, who are those persons who work without pay for 15 or more hours per week on a farm or in a business operated by a member of the household to whom they are related by birth or marriage.

In 2006, Los Angeles County had a mean household income of \$72,779, which is lower than the State average by \$4,607. Los Angeles County's percentage of population in poverty was 15.4 percent in 2000, which is 2.3 percentage points higher than the State (U.S. Census, 2007). Percentage of unemployment however, has generally followed the State's pattern over the past 15 years, as shown in Table 6.10-4.

The counties of Riverside and San Bernardino make up the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). Industry data for the 2 counties are combined, as shown in Table 6.10-6. In 2004, the predominant industries were Trade, Transportation,

TABLE 6.10-6
RIVERSIDE-SAN BERNARDINO MSA¹
COUNTY EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY, 2004-2014

Industry Sector	Employment/Percent of Industry ² , 2004	Employment/Percent of Industry ² , 2014	10-Year Growth Relative to Sector
Total Farm	18,700 (1.6%)	17,200 (1.2%)	-1,500 (-8.0%)
Construction	111,800 (9.5%)	145,300 (9.9%)	33,500 (30.0%)
Education and Health Services	118,400 (10.0%)	147,100 (10.0%)	28,700 (24.2%)
Financial Activities	45,700 (3.9%)	54,800 (3.7%)	9,100 (19.9%)
Government	212,500 (18.0%)	256,600 (17.4%)	44,100 (20.8%)
Information	14,000 (1.1%)	16,400 (1.1%)	2,400 (17.1%)
Leisure and Hospitality	116,700 (9.9%)	149,600 (10.2%)	32,900 (28.2%)
Manufacturing	120,100 (10.2%)	129,000 (8.8%)	8,900 (7.4%)
Natural Resources and Mining	1,200 (0.1%)	1,600 (0.1%)	400 (33.3%)
Professional and Business Services	125,500 (10.7%)	172,500 (11.7%)	47,000 (37.5%)
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	254,900 (21.6%)	334,200 (22.7%)	79,300 (31.1%)
Other Services	39,300 (3.3%)	47,600 (3.2%)	8,300 (21.1%)
Riverside and San Bernardino County Total Employment	1,178,700	1,473,200	294,500 (25.0%)

Source: State of California, Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division, 2007.

¹ MSA: Metropolitan Statistical Area

² Excludes: 1) Unincorporated self-employed. (The estimated and projected employment numbers includes all workers who are primarily self-employed and wage and salary workers who hold a secondary job as a self-employed worker.) 2) Unpaid family workers, whom are those persons who work without pay for 15 or more hours per week on a farm or in a business operated by a member of the household to whom they are related by birth or marriage.

and Utilities, and Government. The next largest industries, albeit somewhat smaller than the previous, were Professional and Business Services and Manufacturing. Strong growth towards 2014 are projected for Professional and Business Services; Trade, Transportation, and Utilities; and Construction; followed by Leisure and Hospitality. The Natural Resources and Mining Sector is also forecasted with a high growth of 33.3 percent by 2014; however, this growth represents an addition of 400 jobs to an employment of 1200 (0.1 percent of the counties' total industries) in 2004. (EDD, 2007)

In 2006, Riverside and San Bernardino counties had mean household incomes of \$74,994 and \$65,827, respectively. Both averages are lower than the State's mean (\$77,386); however, San Bernardino County is significantly below the State's average by nearly 15 percent. Riverside County had a poverty level of 12.2 percent in 2006, while San Bernardino County had a poverty rate of 13.7 percent. Riverside County's poverty population was 0.9 percentage point fewer than the State; however, San Bernardino had a higher population in

poverty than the State by 0.6 percentage point (U.S. Census, 2007). Riverside County has also experienced a history of poverty rates higher than the State.

6.10.1.3 Public Services and Utilities

6.10.1.3.1 Fire Protection and Emergency Response. The COA Fire Department (AFD) provides fire protection and emergency services to the project area. The AFD currently operates 11 fire stations and employs a total of 231 sworn personnel and 60 administrators. The department staffs 12 engine companies, 10 of which are designated paramedic companies, six truck companies; one contract paramedic company; one dual-role hazardous-materials unit; one dual-role technical rescue unit; and two battalions. Fire stations are strategically located to ensure an efficient response to all risk hazards. The Department staffs engine and ladder companies and provides paramedic services, fire suppression, rescue, and hazardous materials response capabilities. Field operations handles all fire, rescue, and medical aid calls for service within 5 minutes 90 percent of the time and manages all major disaster responses.

Selected personnel within the division provide CPR and first aid instruction to other city departments. The Operations Division is responsible for insuring that all personnel are hazardous materials first responder trained and for maintaining one of Orange County's Type I Hazardous Materials Response units and Urban Search And Rescue (USAR) Team. The Operations Division Chief also oversees the management of the Metro Cities Fire Communications Center, which consists of: a communications manager, a training officer, a secretary, a systems specialist, a medical coordinator, a communications operations supervisor, four shift supervisors, and 23 dispatchers. The dispatch center coordinates all fire and emergency medical aid calls for seven partner cities. The dispatch center also manages communications during major incidents, including the dispatching of additional specialized resources.

The COA is also part of a regional coordinating system with other firefighting agencies. Fire units are dispatched through the Metro Cities Fire Authority. The Metro Cities Fire Communications Center currently serves the cities of Anaheim, Fountain Valley, Fullerton, Garden Grove, Huntington Beach, Newport Beach, and Orange.

During facility operations, fire protection will be provided at the facility through a fire water supply described in Section 3.4.11 (Fire Protection and Safety Systems).

6.10.1.3.2 Medical Facilities. The AFD manages the COA's paramedic membership program, emergency ambulance transportation, and billing programs. The AFD coordinates with local hospital emergency departments, health care providers, and the Orange County Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Agency.

The Orange County EMS provides oversight to all providers of emergency medical services, including fire departments, medical transportation providers, base hospitals, emergency departments, trauma centers, and to the emergency medical technician and paramedic training programs within the county. Orange County EMS coordinates with a number of regional ambulance service providers, including air ambulance services, with paramedic receiving centers and hospitals.

The project site is located within a short distance to several hospitals. The Placentia Linda Hospital (1303 North Rose Drive, Placentia) is less than 4 miles from the project site, and equipped with 24-hour emergency, surgery, inpatient/outpatient, and other care services. The Anaheim Memorial Center (1111 West La Palma Avenue) is less than 6 miles from the project site, and also provides emergency, acute care, surgery, inpatient/outpatient, and other care services at its 224-bed hospital facility. Additionally, the Western Medical Center (1025 South Anaheim Boulevard, Anaheim) is approximately 6 miles from the project site, and is a 188-bed full care hospital facility. Services include a 24-hour emergency room, acute care, and cardiology capabilities.

6.10.1.3.3 Law Enforcement. The COA is divided into 4 districts (central, east, west, and south), with one facility per district. Each of these districts is divided into six areas. The districts and areas are used in assigning patrol officers and determining which officers are dispatched for calls for service. The Department is currently authorized for 395 sworn officers who are assigned to all locations within the Anaheim Police Department. The ratio of sworn police officers is approximately 13 officers per 1,000 population.

The project site is located in the east district, which is served by the east district facility located 8.5 miles from the project site, at 8201 E. Santa Ana Canyon Road.

Police services provided include patrol, investigations, traffic enforcement, traffic control, vice and narcotics enforcement, airborne patrol, crime suppression, community policing, tourist-oriented policing, and detention facilities. Furthermore, crime prevention recommendations are provided for all major residential, commercial, and industrial construction projects. The capacity and level of service provided by the Anaheim Police Department is maintained to keep pace with the rate of development and growth in the COA.

6.10.1.3.4 Schools and Libraries. The COA is served by ten school districts, from which 89 schools serve the COA. Data from the school districts serving the vicinity of the project is compiled in Table 6.10-7. The project site is located within the Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District. School capacities for Anaheim City School District, Magnolia School District, Orange Unified School District, and Anaheim Union High School District are presented in Table 6.10-7. As shown, capacities in Anaheim City School District and Anaheim Union High School District are currently exceeded. However, based on the California Board of Education enrollment data, each school district listed has generally been

**TABLE 6.10-7
CITY OF ANAHEIM SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND ENROLLMENT, 2006-2007**

School District	Number of Schools Serving City	Total Enrollment	School Capacity ¹
Elementary			
Anaheim City School District	23	19,958	17,454
Buena Park School District	4	3,349	--
Centralia School District	2	1,339	--
Magnolia School District	9	6,482	6,034
Orange Unified School District	10	7,270	7,618
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified	4	5,351	--
Savanna Elementary School District	4	2,403	--
Junior and High School			
Anaheim Union High School District	12	23,086	20,844
Fullerton School District	5	3,688	--
Fullerton Joint Union High School District	3	6,797	--
Garden Grove Unified School District	13	12,092	--
Orange Unified School District	(included above)	(included above)	--
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified	(included above)	(included above)	--

Source: California Department of Education (2007)

¹ *Anaheim General Plan/Zoning Code Update EIR* (2004).

following a trend of declining enrollment since the 2003-2004 school year. Additionally, based on communication with the Fullerton School District, school districts serving the COA may assign students to specific schools having adequate capacity in order to avoid overloading other schools.

The Anaheim Public Library system consists of a central library, five branches, and two bookmobiles. Services include internet-based library catalog, book reserves, free virtual checkout of e-books, downloadable audio books, and fill text printable/downloadable databases including Business and Company Resource Center, health and wellness resources, magazine, local and national newspapers, and practice tests for school, jobs, and the military.

6.10.1.4 Fiscal Resources

In 2006, the total property tax revenue collected for Orange County was approximately \$4.18 billion (County of Orange, 2006).

SECTION 6.0

ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION

The project site occupies parcel numbers 344-221-03, 344-221-04, and 344-221-09, which are located in the County’s Tax Rate Area (TRA) 01-076. Property tax is currently collected at a 1.0 percent basic levy rate plus special assessments. The 1 percent basic levy is disbursed to the COA, Metropolitan Water District (MWD), North Orange County Community College District, and Placentia-Yorba Linda School District according to allocations shown in Table 6.10-8. Special assessment user fees are assessed separately based on site parameters for each parcel, and are collected for the Mosquito and Ant Assessment, Vector Control, MWD Water Standby Charge, and Orange County Sanitation District User Fee. The assessed basic levy and special assessment fees and their disbursements for the 2007-2008 tax year are presented in Table 6.10-8. As shown, the total property tax assessed for the 3 parcels is \$22,889.44 [\$2,687.38 + \$6,200.06 + \$14,002.00] for 2007-2008.

**TABLE 6.10-8
PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENT AND
DISBURSEMENT FOR PROJECT SITE 2007-2008**

Beneficiary Agency	Property Tax Base Factor	Allocated Basic Levies and Special Assessments ¹		
		Parcel Number 344-221-03	Parcel Number 344-221-04	Parcel Number 344-221-09
Basic Levies				
Placentia-Yorba Linda School 2002 Bond 2002	0.01464	\$33.22	\$85.37	\$108.77
Placentia-Yorba Linda School 2002 Bond 2004	0.00849	\$19.27	\$49.52	\$63.08
Placentia-Yorba Linda School 2002 Bond 2005	0.00637	\$14.46	\$37.15	\$47.33
Metropolitan Water District	0.00450	\$10.21	\$26.24	\$33.44
North Orange County Community College District 2002 Bond 2005R	0.00893	\$20.26	\$52.08	\$66.35
North Orange County Community College District 2002 Bond 2003	0.00349	\$7.92	\$20.35	\$25.93
North Orange County Community College District 2002 Bond 2002A	0.00260	\$5.90	\$15.17	\$19.31
City of Anaheim 1980 Bond	0.00225	\$5.10	\$13.12	\$16.72
Special Assessments				
Mosquito and Fire Ant Assessment	--	\$5.14	\$38.54	\$23.12
Vector Control Charge	--	\$1.92	\$6.24	\$6.24
Metropolitan Water District Water Standby Charge	--	\$39.84	\$24.36	\$15.56
Orange County Sanitation District User Fee	--	\$254.80	--	\$6,146.14
Total Tax Assessed		\$2,687.38	\$6,200.06	\$14,002.00

¹ Treasurer Tax Collector (TTC), Orange County, California. 2007.

6.10.2 Environmental Consequences

The criteria used in determining whether project-related socioeconomic impacts would be significant are presented in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Appendix G. Impacts attributable to the project are considered significant if they would:

- Induce substantial growth or reduction of population in an area
- Displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere
- Induce substantial increase in demand for public services and utilities
- Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community
- Result in substantial long-term disruptions to businesses

This analysis will assess the potential occurrence and significance of socioeconomic impacts for the construction and operation of the CPP. The methodology used to analyze the environmental justice aspects of the project is detailed in legislation and guidelines in Section 6.10.3.

6.10.2.1 Population and Housing During Construction Phase

Estimated labor personnel requirements during the construction and commissioning phases of the project are shown in Table 6.10-9. As mentioned in Section 6.10.2.2, a large regional workforce is available within commuting distance to the project site, and is anticipated to supply the labor required for the construction. It has been assumed for this analysis that manual labor staff would be comprised of local workers and contractor staff would be non-local workers temporarily working in the area. This analysis also assumes that during an average work week, non-local workers will lodge in local hotels and motels, and then return home for the weekend. Local workers for the project are expected to commute to the project, rather than relocate.

The project estimates that the maximum percentage of non-local workers (excluding management) supporting the project during construction would be 5 percent. As shown in Table 6.10-9, the seventh month after the notice to proceed would have the highest number of potential non-local labor personnel including contractor staff, which results to a total of 40 potential non-local workers serving the project construction. Following construction, the non-local workers are expected to return to their existing residences. In this way, the project is not expected to significantly impact the population in the study area during construction.

In consideration of the available local workforce and the number of non-local workers, the project does not anticipate significant impacts to the housing in the project vicinity during project construction. Non-local workers are expected to temporarily lodge in hotels and

**TABLE 6.10-9
LABOR PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS BY MONTH**

Discipline	Months After Notice to Proceed												Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Construction Phase													
Carpenters	4	8	10	10	8	8	6	4	2	2	2	--	64
Cement Masons and Concrete Finishers	4	12	16	16	12	10	8	6	2	2	2		90
Electricians	8	16	20	30	40	40	40	40	30	20	10	2	296
Engineering Site Staff	4	6	6	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	6	5	81
Insulation Workers	--	--	--	2	6	6	12	12	12	12	8	2	72
Ironworkers	--	4	4	10	20	26	26	20	20	10	4	--	144
Laborers	18	12	14	16	18	18	18	18	16	12	6	2	168
Millwrights	--	2	4	10	14	18	18	18	14	12	6	--	116
Equipment Operators	13	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	6	4	2	103
Painters	--	--	--	--	2	2	4	4	6	6	2	1	27
Pipe Fitters	--	8	12	16	16	16	16	16	12	8	4	2	126
Surveyors	2	2	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	2	8
Teamsters	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	1	--	39
Commissioning/Testing	--	--	--	2	4	6	8	10	12	12	12	8	74
Total Contractor Staff	10	14	17	23	28	29	30	29	25	19	11	4	239
Underground 69 kV Transmission Line with Fiber Optic Cable													
Carpenters	--	--	--	2	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
Electricians	--	--	--	--	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	8
Equipment Operators	--	--	--	4	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	8
Foremen	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
Laborers	--	--	--	5	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	10

**TABLE 6.10-9 (CONTINUED)
LABOR PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS BY MONTH**

Discipline	Months After Notice to Proceed												Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Underground Pipeline Linears, Natural Gas, GRS Water													
Carpenters	--	--	--	--	2	2	2	2	--	--	--	--	8
Equipment Operators	--	--	--	--	4	4	4	4	--	--	--	--	16
Foremen	--	--	--	--	1	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	4
Laborers	--	--	--	--	4	5	5	4	--	--	--	--	18
Pipe Fitters	--	--	--	--	4	4	4	4	--	--	--	--	16
Total Number of Positions	67	98	117	169	225	217	224	216	170	130	78	30	1,741

motels within the project vicinity. Based on the number of hotels and motels, and their vacancy rates in the project vicinity, the project anticipates that a sufficient supply of lodging would be available to accommodate the workers. Additionally, since the project expects to be able to hire its additional staff from the existing labor force in the region, the project concludes that the impact to local housing will also be insignificant.

The proposed project does not involve changing, disrupting, or dividing the physical arrangement of an established community, since the project area is located on property zoned for industrial use. Additionally, construction of the CPP would not result in substantial long-term disruption to businesses, as construction staging would occur on the project site (as described in Section 3.0).

6.10.2.2 Employment During Construction

According to the Electric Power Research Institute's (EPRI's) report entitled, *Socioeconomic Impacts of Power Plants*, construction workers will commute as much as two hours to construction sites from their homes, rather than relocate. Given the region's existing and growing construction workforce (Table 6.10-10), it is expected that the project would not encounter difficulties finding an available labor force within the daily commuting distance to supply the work force associated with construction of the proposed project.

The CPP will provide approximately \$11.9 million (in 2007 dollars) in direct construction payroll at an approximate annual salary of \$82,000, including benefits. Indirect and induced employment as a result of project construction are discussed in Section 6.10.2.7.4.

6.10.2.3 Project Impacts to Population and Housing During Operations

As shown in Table 6.10-11, the project is expected to require nine full-time employees during operations. Of these, two would be new hires while the remaining seven would be existing employees. Because there is a large skilled labor pool in the Orange, Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino County region, and operation workers would commute as much as one hour to the facility site from their homes, it is expected that the two new employees are available and would be hired from the project region, rather than relocate. As a result, operation of the CPP would not be expected to cause an influx of operation workers to relocate to the local area, and therefore, would have no significant impact on the population and housing in the study area.

Operation of the CPP does not involve changing, disrupting, or dividing the physical arrangement of an established community, since the project area is located on property zoned for industrial use. Additionally, operation of the facility would not result in substantial long-term disruption to businesses.

**TABLE 6.10-10
CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OCCUPATIONAL PROJECTIONS OF EMPLOYMENT IN PROJECT REGION**

Occupational Title	SOC ¹ Code	Counties Comprising Project Region	Workforce, 2004	Total Workforce, 2004	Projected Workforce, 2014	Total Projected Workforce, 2014	Projected Growth from 2004
Carpenters	472031	Orange	19,560	72,290	23,970	88,800	16,510 (22.8%)
		Los Angeles	24,680		27,330		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	28,050		37,500		
Cement Masons and Concrete Finishers	472051	Orange	2,720	11,760	3,430	14,750	2,990 (25.4%)
		Los Angeles	3,870		4,370		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	5,170		6,950		
Construction Laborers	472061	Orange	11,990	56,820	13,110	64,280	7,460 (13.1%)
		Los Angeles	24,820		25,880		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	20,010		25,290		
Electrical Engineers	172071	Orange	2,520	7,210	3,090	8,430	1,220 (16.9%)
		Los Angeles	4,220		4,690		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	470		650		
Electricians	472111	Orange	6,700	27,030	8,320	30,730	3,700 (13.7%)
		Los Angeles	13,600		14,550		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	6,730		7,860		
Insulation Workers	472131	Orange	130	1,260	140	1,290	30 (2.4%)
		Los Angeles	910		910		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	220		240		

TABLE 6.10-10 (CONTINUED)
CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OCCUPATIONAL PROJECTIONS OF EMPLOYMENT IN PROJECT REGION

Occupational Title	SOC ¹ Code	Counties Comprising Project Region	Workforce, 2004	Total Workforce, 2004	Projected Workforce, 2014	Total Projected Workforce, 2014	Projected Growth from 2004
Mechanical Engineers	172141	Orange	2,760	9,820	3,310	10,880	1,060 (10.8%)
		Los Angeles	5,910		6,180		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	1,150		1,390		
Millwrights	499044	Orange	n/a	1,070	n/a	1,120	50 (4.7%)
		Los Angeles	950		970		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	120		150		
Operating Engineers and Other Construction Equipment Operators	472073	Orange	2,420	10,480	2,920	12,670	2,190 (20.9%)
		Los Angeles	4,080		4,580		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	3,980		5,170		
Painters, Construction and Maintenance	472141	Orange	7,090	27,070	8,590	31,440	4,370 (16.1%)
		Los Angeles	12,410		13,440		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	7,570		9,410		
Plant and System Operators	518000	Orange	1,120	7,630	1,250	8,290	660 (8.7%)
		Los Angeles	4,700		4,890		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	1,810		2,150		
Power Plant Operators	518013	Orange	130	970	130	1,080	110 (11.3%)
		Los Angeles	390		420		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	450		530		
Plumbers, Pipe Fitters, and Steamfitters	472152	Orange	5,790	23,030	7,320	26,750	3,720 (16.2%)
		Los Angeles	12,580		13,780		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	4,660		5,650		

TABLE 6.10-10 (CONTINUED)
CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OCCUPATIONAL PROJECTIONS OF EMPLOYMENT IN PROJECT REGION

Occupational Title	SOC ¹ Code	Counties Comprising Project Region	Workforce, 2004	Total Workforce, 2004	Projected Workforce, 2014	Total Projected Workforce, 2014	Projected Growth from 2004
Secretaries and Administrative Assistants	546000	Orange	42,500	315,100	46,880	469,080	101,980 (32.4%)
		Los Angeles ²	244,700		308,400		
		Riverside and San Bernardino ²	27,900		113,800		
Surveyors	171022	Orange	670	1,900	830	2,260	360 (18.9%)
		Los Angeles	730		810		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	500		620		
Industrial Truck and Tractor Operations	537051	Orange	5,370	33,840	6,140	39,860	6,020 (17.8%)
		Los Angeles	19,310		21,510		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	9,160		12,210		
Welders, Cutters, Solderers, and Brazers	514121	Orange	2,620	15,090	2,970	15,660	570 (3.8%)
		Los Angeles	8,520		8,270		
		Riverside and San Bernardino	3,950		4,420		

Source: State of California Employment Development Department, 2007.

¹ SOC: Standard Occupational Code

² 2004 and 2014 data based on NAICS Code 561, Administrative and Support Services.

**TABLE 6.10-11
CPP ESTIMATED STAFF DURING OPERATIONS**

Department	Position	Number of Employees	Shift	Workdays
Operations	Plant Technician	4	Two 2-person shifts per day; OT as required.	7 days per week
Maintenance	Maintenance Technician	2	Standard 8-hour day; OT as required.	5 days per week
Management	Office Specialist	1	Standard 8-hour day	5 days per week
	O&M Supervisor	1	Standard 8-hour day	5 days per week
	Plant Manager	1	Standard 8-hour day	5 days per week

6.10.2.4 Employment During Operation

The CPP will require a staff of nine employees for operation. Of these, seven employees are existing workers (five generation technicians, one generation manager, and one office specialist), and two will be new hires (one operations and maintenance [O&M] supervisor and one generation technician), as shown on Table 6.10-11. According to *Socioeconomic Impacts of Power Plants* (EPRI), permanent employees will commute as much as one hour to their workplace. As presented in Table 6.10-10 the workforce in Orange, Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties collectively provides sizable resources of potential hires for the two positions. It is reasonably anticipated that the two new positions required for the operation phase may be hired from a commuting distance from the proposed project. As a result, the proposed project expects not to encounter significant employee relocation effects for its operation.

The average salary per employee is expected to be approximately \$80,000 per year, including benefits. Combined, the annual operation payroll will be approximately \$723,000 for the facility. The combined annual salary for the two new employees is expected to be \$189,000, including benefits.

6.10.2.5 Public Services

6.10.2.5.1 Fire Protection and Emergency Services. Emergency services during construction would be coordinated with the AFD and with local medical facilities. As discussed previously, an integrated paramedic service and multiple medical facilities are available in the region. Extinguishers will be available onsite, and personnel will be trained in their proper use. Communication equipment will be available onsite at all times in order to contact outside agencies if emergencies arise. Based on the AFD resources and construction practices, no significant impacts during construction are expected on local public social and medical services.

The facility design will include a central fire alarm panel which would continuously monitor all facility fire protection systems and alert the control room operator in the event of a fire during operation. The fire alarm panel would also send a direct fire alarm signal to the COA Fire Department and COA power dispatch control office. Additionally, portable multi-use fire extinguishers will be located in buildings and throughout the facility with accordance with National Fire Protection (NFPA) recommendations and AFD requirements. Based on consultation with the AFD (Logue, 2007) and project measures during operation, no significant impacts are expected on local public social services.

The project area would be served by Kraemer Station 5, located at 1154 North Kraemer Boulevard less than 0.5 mile from the project site. Station 5 houses Paramedic Engine 5. Response times for the AFD require first engine response within 5 minutes to 90 percent of all incidents and 8 minutes to the remaining 10 percent. The AFD requires a maximum of 10 minutes for truck company response to 100 percent of all incidents.

6.10.2.5.2 Medical Services. The project area is served by several hospitals equipped to provide 24-hour emergency room, acute care, and cardiology capabilities. Based on the project's health and safety practices, as described in Section 6.17 Worker Safety and the hospital capacities (Section 6.10.1.3.2), no significant impacts are expected on medical services during construction and operation of the project.

6.10.2.5.3 Police Protection. The project area would be served with the Anaheim Police Department's East District. The current goal for response time for patrol units to Priority 1 emergency calls throughout the jurisdiction is 7 minutes, and the actual average response time is approximately 6.1 minutes. Goals for non-emergency Priority 2 and 3 response times are 20 and 30 minutes respectively, and actual average response times are 8.6 minutes and 19.2 minutes, respectively.

Based on consultation with the Anaheim Police Department (Martinez, 2007), the Anaheim Police Department is expected to have sufficient capacity to provide law enforcement services to the proposed project during both construction and operational phases. Neither construction nor the additional two operational employees would result in a substantial increase in demand for police protection.

6.10.2.5.4 Schools and Libraries. Because a sufficient labor pool exists within commuting distance of the proposed project, it is anticipated that construction workers will commute to the project site, and non-local construction workers would stay in hotels and motels throughout the extent of construction, rather than relocate. Based on the regional workforce, the two additional employees required during project operation are expected to be hired within a commuting distance to the facility; however, in the event that these two employees are hired from outside the project region, it is expected that the school districts within the COA could accommodate these two families. As a result, the proposed project is expected to

result in no or negligible impacts to schools and libraries during the project construction and operation.

6.10.2.6 Utilities

The following subsections summarize the project's approach to evaluate impacts to public utilities. The project will result in no significant impact to the project vicinity.

6.10.2.6.1 Electricity. When the facility is shut down, electricity for the project site will be provided by the COA's existing power grid by backfeeding through the one of the GSUs. Additionally, the facility would be designed with an essential service alternating current (AC) system and direct current (DC) power supply system to ensure that critical safety and unit protection control circuits have power in the event of abnormal or emergency conditions. When the facility is operating, balance of plant would be supplied internally.

6.10.2.6.2 Natural Gas. As described above, natural gas will be delivered to the CPP through connection into a Southern California Gas Company (SCGC) trunk line. The natural gas will be delivered to an underground pipeline up to 16-inches in diameter, capable of supporting an adequate supply for the facility operation.

6.10.2.6.3 Potable Water. The COA potable water supply will provide the potable water supplies for the facility's domestic use, eye wash stations, and safety showers, as well as the facility fire protection loop. Based on the analysis detailed in Section 6.5, Water Resources, construction and operation of the proposed project is expected to result in no significant impact to potable water supplies.

6.10.2.6.4 Process Water. The Orange County Water District has determined that ample supplies of recycled water through the GWRS would be available to the proposed project, for use as process water uses. Connection into the GWRS would require installation of approximately 2,200 feet of an underground line up to 12-inches in diameter. Based on Section 6.5, Water Resources, the project expects to result in no significant impact on the recycled water supplies.

6.10.2.6.5 Sewage System. During construction, the project will provide portable restrooms for personnel. During operation, the facility sanitary system would connect into the OCSD sanitary sewer system. A small amount of sanitary sewage is expected to be generated during operation, due to the relatively small number of employees required to operate the facility. Based on sewer capacity studies and consultation with the COA Public Works and the Orange County Sanitary District, the Project has determined that the facility would result in no significant impact to the sanitary sewer capacity (Wu, 2007).

6.10.2.7 Fiscal Resources

6.10.2.7.1 Property Tax. The COA owns the land comprising the project site area for the proposed project. According to Article 13 of the California Constitution, which states that “property owned by a local government (except those that are outside of its boundaries), are exempt from property taxes,” the COA would be exempt from property tax assessment and collection.

6.10.2.7.2 Sales Tax. During construction, local commodities expenditures are expected to be approximately \$733,000 for each county of Orange, Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino, for an estimated total of \$2.9 million. Sales tax and allocations resulting from local expenditures are presented for Orange County in Table 6.10-12, Los Angeles County in Table 6.10-13, Riverside County in Table 6.10-14, and San Bernardino in Table 6.10-15. As shown, total sales tax paid during construction is \$230,987 for the four-county area [\$56,808 + \$14,438 + \$56,808 + \$56,808]. Estimated local expenditures and sales tax are reported in 2007 dollars.

**TABLE 6.10-12
ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION AND
OPERATION SALES TAX FOR ORANGE COUNTY**

Recipient	Percentage Sales Tax Allocation ¹	CPP Construction Estimated Sales Tax ² (2007 U.S. dollars)	CPP Operation Estimated Sales Tax (2007 U.S. dollars)
Statewide Base Sales/Use Tax (7.25%)			
State General Fund	5.0	\$36,650	\$8,750
State Fiscal Recovery Fund	0.25	\$1,833	\$438
State Local Revenue Fund	0.50	\$3,665	\$875
State Local Public Safety Fund	0.50	\$3,665	\$875
Local County Transportation Funds	0.25	\$1,833	\$438
Local Allocation to City and County Operations	0.75	\$5,498	\$1,313
County District Tax³			
Orange County Local Transportation Authority (OCTA)	0.50	\$3,665	\$875
Total Sales/Use Tax⁴	7.75	\$56,808	\$13,563

¹ California Board of Equalization, 2007.

² Sales tax is based on estimated value of materials and supplies purchased during construction (\$733,000) and operation (\$175,000) in Orange County.

³ Tax rate for jurisdictions within Orange County, with exception of the City of Laguna Beach and South Laguna, which have an additional 0.50% City of Laguna Beach Temporary transactions and Use Tax.

⁴ Individual values may have slight discrepancies from summed values as a result of rounding.

**TABLE 6.10-13
ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION AND
OPERATION SALES TAX FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY**

Recipient	Percentage Sales Tax Allocation ¹	CPP Construction Estimated Sales Tax ² (2007 U.S. dollars)	CPP Operation Estimated Sales Tax ² (2007 U.S. dollars)
Statewide Base Sales/Use Tax (7.25%)			
State General Fund	5.0	\$36,650	\$8,750
State Fiscal Recovery Fund	0.25	\$1,833	\$438
State Local Revenue Fund	0.50	\$3,665	\$875
State Local Public Safety Fund	0.50	\$3,665	\$875
Local County Transportation Funds	0.25	\$1,833	\$438
Local Allocation to City and County Operations	0.75	\$5,498	\$1,313
County District Tax³			
Los Angeles County Transportation Commission	1.0	\$7,330	\$1,750
Total Sales/Use Tax⁴	8.25	\$60,473	\$14,438

¹ California Board of Equalization, 2007.

² Sales tax is based on estimated value of materials and supplies purchased during construction (\$733,000) and operation (\$175,000) in Los Angeles County.

³ Tax rate for jurisdictions within Los Angeles County, with exception of the City of Avalon and Inglewood.

⁴ Individual values may have slight discrepancies from summed values as a result of rounding.

During project operation, local commodities expenditures are expected to be approximately \$700,000, with an estimated \$175,000 spent in each of the four county areas. Sales tax and allocations resulting from local expenditures are presented for Orange County in Table 6.10-12, Los Angeles County in Table 6.10-13, Riverside County in Table 6.10-14, and San Bernardino in Table 6.10-15. As shown, total sales tax paid annually during operation is \$55,127 [\$13,563 + \$14,438 + \$13,563 + \$13,563]. Estimated local expenditures and sales tax are reported in 2007 dollars.

6.10.2.7.3 School Impact Fees. Typically, most developments are required to pay a development fee, or school impact fee to offset the potential impacts of the development on the school. Based on consultation with the Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District, which serves the project area, school impact fees are exempt for the CPP, as a result of the property being city-owned (Alvarez, 2007).

6.10.2.7.4 Indirect and Induced Economic Effects. The following presents expected secondary economic effects during both construction and operation of the CPP. *Indirect effects* represent the impacts (e.g., change in employment) caused by the iteration of industries purchasing from industries resulting from direct final demand changes. *Induced*

**TABLE 6.10-14
ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION AND
OPERATION SALES TAX FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY**

Recipient	Percentage Sales Tax Allocation ¹	CPP Construction Estimated Sales Tax ² (2007 U.S. dollars)	CPP Operation Estimated Sales Tax ² (2007 U.S. dollars)
Statewide Base Sales/Use Tax (7.25%)			
State General Fund	5.0	\$36,650	\$8,750
State Fiscal Recovery Fund	0.25	\$1,833	\$438
State Local Revenue Fund	0.50	\$3,665	\$875
State Local Public Safety Fund	0.50	\$3,665	\$875
Local County Transportation Funds	0.25	\$1,833	\$438
Local Allocation to City and County Operations	0.75	\$5,498	\$1,313
County District Tax			
Riverside County Transportation Commission	0.50	\$3,665	\$875
Total Sales/Use Tax³	7.75	\$56,808	\$13,563

¹ California Board of Equalization, 2007.

² Sales tax is based on estimated value of materials and supplies purchased during construction (\$733,000) and operation (\$175,000) in Riverside County.

³ Individual values may have slight discrepancies from summed values as a result of rounding.

effects represent the impacts (e.g., change in employment) on all industries caused by the expenditures of new household income generated by the direct and indirect effects of direct final demand changes. IMPLAN Professional Version 2.0.1025 was used to create an input/output model assessing these economic impacts.

Indirect and Induced Economic Effects During Project Construction. Construction activity would result in secondary economic and employment impacts (indirect and induced impacts) that would occur within counties within the project region, which consists of Orange, Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. The affected project region was determined based on: 1) the available labor force within reasonable commuting distance to serve the construction needs of the project, and 2) locations where supplies and materials are expected to be purchased.

Indirect and induced income and spending effects occur due to purchase of goods and services by firms involved with construction. Indirect employment effects and induced employment result from construction workers spending their income in their local area, and typically lag behind direct effects by 6 to 12 months.

TABLE 6.10-15
ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION AND
OPERATION SALES TAX FOR SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Recipient	Percentage Sales Tax Allocation ¹	CPP Construction Estimated Sales Tax ² (2007 U.S. dollars)	CPP Operation Estimated Sales Tax ² (2007 U.S. dollars)
Statewide Base Sales/Use Tax (7.25%)			
State General Fund	5.0	\$36,650	\$8,750
State Fiscal Recovery Fund	0.25	\$1,833	\$438
State Local Revenue Fund	0.50	\$3,665	\$875
State Local Public Safety Fund	0.50	\$3,665	\$875
Local County Transportation Funds	0.25	\$1,833	\$438
Local Allocation to City and County Operations	0.75	\$5,498	\$1,313
County District Tax			
San Bernardino County Transportation Authority	0.50	\$3,665	\$875
Total Sales/Use Tax³	7.75	\$56,808	\$13,563

¹ California Board of Equalization, 2007.

² Sales tax is based on estimated value of materials and supplies purchased during construction (\$733,000) and operation (\$175,000) in San Bernardino County.

³ Individual values may have slight discrepancies from summed values as a result of rounding.

The modeling input was based on the CPP's estimated initial capital cost of \$174 million for project construction, expenditures of \$2.9 million for materials, and an average direct construction employment of 145, having a combined payroll of \$11.9 million. IMPLAN Pro Sector 41¹ (Other New Construction, Power Plants) was used for this analysis, and economic estimates were based on 2007 dollars. The estimated indirect and induced employment from Orange, Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties during construction of the CPP are 12 and 94 jobs, respectively. These additional jobs result from the \$2.2 million in local construction expenditures, as well as approximately \$11.9 million in payroll. Assuming an average direct construction employment of 145, the employment multiplier associated with the construction of the CPP is approximately 1.7 ($[145 + 12 + 94]/145$). This project construction employment multiplier is based on a Social Accounting Matrix (SAM) type model. These additional jobs would result from local construction expenditures as well as from spending by local construction workers. These secondary jobs are expected to be filled both locally and regionally.

Indirect and induced income impacts were estimated at \$703,460 and \$4,193,160, respectively. Assuming a total annual local construction expenditure (payroll and materials

¹ Sector 41, Other New Construction, Power Plants, is considered the most appropriate modeling matrix, based on consultation with the Minnesota IMPLAN Group (MIG), Inc.

and supplies) of \$14,100,000 (\$11.9 million in payroll and \$2.2 million in supplies), the project income multiplier based on a Type SAM model is approximately 1.3 ($[\$14,100,700 + \$703,460 + \$4,193,160]/\$14,100,000$).

The proposed project's output describes the value of production by the industry. Output includes spending for materials and supplies (non-labor costs), plus value added, which is comprised of employee compensation, proprietary income, other property income, and indirect business taxes. The CPP's indirect and induced outputs for dollars generated by other industries supplying construction of power facilities were estimated at \$1,884,900 and \$12,798,600, respectively. The project output multiplier based on a Type SAM model is approximately 1.9 ($[\$17,060,000 + \$1,884,900 + \$12,798,600]/\$17,060,000$).

Indirect and Induced Effects from Project Operation. Similar to project construction, operation of the CPP would result in indirect and induced economic impacts occurring within Orange, Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. As with the construction phase, the affected project region during operation was determined based on: 1) the available labor force within reasonable commuting distance to serve the operation phase of the project, and 2) locations where operations and maintenance supplies and materials are expected to be purchased. Unlike construction indirect and induced impacts, operational indirect and induced impacts represent *permanent* increases in area jobs, income, and spending. These impacts would lag behind direct effects by 6 to 12 months.

The modeling input was based on estimated annual O&M budget of about \$3.2 million, local operation expenditures of \$700,000 for materials, and an average direct employment of 9 people, having a combined payroll of \$722,762. Fuel costs were not included in the IMPLAN modeling, since natural gas prices are variable and unknown, and the effects of the purchase would not likely occur within the project region. IMPLAN Pro Sector 30 (Power Generation and Supply) was used for this analysis, and economic estimates were based on 2007 dollars.

The resulting indirect and induced effects of the CPP operation occurring in Orange, Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties would be 1 and 4 jobs, respectively. These additional jobs result from the \$700,000 in operations and maintenance, as well as \$722,762 in payroll. Assuming a direct operation employment of 9, the employment multiplier associated with the operation of CPP is approximately 1.6 ($[9 + 1 + 4]/9$). This project construction employment multiplier is based on a Type SAM model.

Indirect and induced income impacts are estimated at \$69,328 and \$166,499, respectively. The income multiplier associated with the operational phase of the project is approximately 1.5 ($[\$722,762 + \$69,328 + \$166,499]/\$722,762$), and is based on a Type SAM multiplier.

The CPP's indirect and induced outputs for dollars generated by other industries supplying power generation were estimated at \$217,990 and \$510,675, respectively. The project output

multiplier based on a Type SAM model is approximately 1.5 $([\$1,454,597 + \$217,990 + \$510,675]/\$1,454,597)$.

6.10.3 Environmental Justice

In response to Executive Orders 12250 and 12898, the CEC is required to consider environmental justice claims in the siting process. President Carter signed EO 12250 in 1980, which directed federal agencies to adopt “disparate impact” regulations. “Disparate impacts” may be claimed if a minority community can demonstrate unique, different, and negative effects on their population, as a result of the actions of a state’s permitting agency (Scoll, 2003).

EO 12898 directs each federal agency and state agencies such as the CEC, which receive federal assistance to “make environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high or adverse human health effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations...” In this respect, the CEC considers a “high and adverse” environmental or health effect disproportionately falling upon a minority or low-income population in its analysis of environmental justice.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)’s published guideline for addressing environmental justice concerns, Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA’s NEPA Compliance Analyses (1998), emphasizes the importance of selecting an analytical approach that is appropriate to the unique circumstances of the community potentially affected by a proposed project. The guidance also encourages the analyst to apply best judgment when drawing conclusions on whether the project may affect a low-income community disproportionately.

6.10.3.1 Environmental Justice Screening Analysis

The environmental justice screening analysis assesses whether “the potentially affected community includes minority and/or low income populations.” A minority and/or low-income population exists when the minority population exceeds 50 percent of the affected area’s total population. Additionally, the screening analysis includes comparing the characteristics of the population residing near the proposed project versus the population located within the county area surrounding the proposed project.

The following criteria may be used during environmental justice screening and impact assessment:

- The minority or low-income population may be identified for the affected area if the minority or low-income population of the affected area is greater than 50 percent of the affected area’s general population

- The minority or low-income population percentage of the area is “meaningfully greater” than the minority population percentage in the general population or other appropriate unit of geographic analysis
- Whether potential environmental impacts attributable to the project would fall disproportionately on the minority or low-income residents of the community

In the following analysis, the percentages of minority and low-income populations were assessed for each census tract that falls entirely or partly within the environmental justice project area (EJ project area), which is bound by the 6-mile radius around the proposed project site. 2000 U.S. Census data were used to characterize affected populations in terms of poverty status and ethnic/racial composition. To place these data within a broader and more appropriate geographic context, they were compared to similar data collected for each affected county. In this case, the area within the 6-mile radius consists of 149 census tracts in Orange County, and 2 census tracts in Los Angeles County. Impacts were then assessed by determining whether disproportionate impacts associated with the proposed project would occur in an area occupied by low-income or minority populations as defined above.

6.10.3.1.1 Minority Population Analysis. The project area within the 6-mile radius from the project site is made up of 151 census tracts, which consist of a total of 753,952 inhabitants, as presented in Table 6.10-16. Figure 6.10-1 shows the EJ project area census tracts and the associated minority data. Of the census tracts, 31 tracts have minority populations greater than 50 percent. Within the entire area encompassed by the 6-mile radius however, 37.4 percent of the inhabitants are minority residents. As a result, inhabitants in the project area within the 6-mile radius do not consist of minority populations exceeding the 50 percent threshold.

According to the Guidance, in addition to the 50 percent threshold, minority populations may also be identified where the proportion of minority residents within the EJ project area are “meaningfully greater” than the region as a whole. As indicated in Table 6.10-16, Orange County has a total minority percentage of 35.2 percent, and Los Angeles County has a total minority percentage of 51.3 percent. The total percentage of the minority population within the EJ project area is 37.4 percent, which is greater than the more conservative county total (i.e., Orange County) by 2.2 percentage points. Because this difference is relatively small, this analysis determines that the minority population within the EJ project area is not “meaningfully greater” than the project region.

As a result, this analysis concludes that no minority populations occur which: 1) exceed the 50 percent threshold within the EJ project area; and 2) are considered meaningfully greater than the project region.

6.10.3.1.2 Low-income Population Analysis. For the purposes of the low-income analysis, “low income” is defined as individuals living below the Federal poverty thresholds (US

**TABLE 6.10-16
ETHNIC AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS:
PROJECT REGION AND WITHIN 6 MILES OF PROPOSED PROJECT**

Jurisdiction/Census Tract Number	Total Population, 2000	White Population (%)	Minority Population (%)	Individuals Above Federal Poverty Level (%)	Individuals Below Federal Poverty Level (%)
Census Tracts within Orange County					
13.03	5,750	61.2%	38.8%	89.5%	10.5%
13.04	3,945	50.4%	49.6%	78.1%	21.9%
14.02	5,195	67.7%	32.3%	90.7%	9.3%
14.03	3,272	83.0%	17.0%	97.6%	2.4%
14.04	3,767	50.5%	49.5%	81.9%	18.1%
15.01	5,747	80.9%	19.1%	98.3%	1.7%
15.03	5,088	79.3%	20.7%	90.8%	9.2%
15.04	4,459	68.8%	31.2%	91.8%	8.2%
15.05	6,432	77.9%	22.1%	94.4%	5.6%
15.06	4,319	76.1%	23.9%	95.5%	4.5%
15.07	4,290	78.1%	21.9%	97.0%	3.0%
16.01	6,824	80.4%	19.6%	96.4%	3.6%
16.02	4,292	77.6%	22.4%	97.2%	2.8%
17.04	2,890	62.2%	37.8%	95.2%	4.8%
17.05	4,359	65.7%	34.3%	84.1%	15.9%
17.06	3,716	79.6%	20.4%	96.9%	3.1%
17.07 ¹	6,192	37.0%	63.0%	96.1%	3.9%
17.08	3,934	62.9%	37.1%	96.4%	3.6%
19.01	2,703	65.9%	34.1%	98.3%	1.7%
19.02	2,927	67.9%	32.1%	84.2%	15.8%
19.03	2,998	59.2%	40.8%	82.0%	18.0%
110.00	6,502	71.3%	28.7%	88.9%	11.1%
111.01	3,972	60.9%	39.1%	86.7%	13.3%
111.02 ¹	4,528	50.0%	50.0%	92.3%	7.7%
112.00	3,991	74.4%	25.6%	90.6%	9.4%
113.00	3,759	77.9%	22.1%	91.7%	8.3%
114.01	2,094	80.4%	19.6%	94.4%	5.6%
114.02	2,311	87.8%	12.2%	98.6%	1.4%
114.03	5,655	64.2%	35.8%	87.9%	12.1%
115.02	4,007	59.5%	40.5%	85.7%	14.3%

TABLE 6.10-16 (CONTINUED)
ETHNIC AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS:
PROJECT REGION AND WITHIN 6 MILES OF PROPOSED PROJECT

Jurisdiction/Census Tract Number	Total Population, 2000	White Population (%)	Minority Population (%)	Individuals Above Federal Poverty Level (%)	Individuals Below Federal Poverty Level (%)
115.03	1,750	85.8%	14.2%	92.7%	7.3%
115.04	5,362	56.5%	43.5%	82.5%	17.5%
116.01 ¹	8,292	47.0%	53.0%	73.8%	26.2%
116.02	5,762	53.7%	46.3%	81.7%	18.3%
117.07	4,379	75.8%	24.2%	93.0%	7.0%
117.08	4,406	66.1%	33.9%	82.9%	17.1%
117.09	4,399	85.0%	15.0%	98.4%	1.6%
117.10	3,526	84.9%	15.1%	95.4%	4.6%
117.11	7,226	57.1%	42.9%	84.5%	15.5%
117.12	4,687	60.9%	39.1%	91.1%	8.9%
117.14 ¹	220	39.5%	60.5%	55.9%	44.1%
117.15	5,711	80.2%	19.8%	98.1%	1.9%
117.16	4,213	55.9%	44.1%	93.7%	6.3%
117.17	2,693	89.0%	11.0%	90.6%	9.4%
117.18	3,361	83.6%	16.4%	97.5%	2.5%
117.20 ¹	7,535	40.5%	59.5%	70.6%	29.4%
117.21 ¹	4,654	49.0%	51.0%	80.9%	19.1%
117.22	3,136	59.6%	40.4%	84.6%	15.4%
218.02	6,538	85.4%	14.6%	94.7%	5.3%
218.07	3,822	82.9%	17.1%	91.9%	8.1%
218.09	2,616	90.7%	9.3%	93.5%	6.5%
218.10	3,681	85.7%	14.3%	95.6%	4.4%
218.12	6,505	78.2%	21.8%	95.5%	4.5%
218.13 ¹	30	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	0.0%
218.14	6,997	74.5%	25.5%	93.9%	6.1%
218.15	3,119	84.9%	15.1%	97.3%	2.7%
218.16	4,943	86.4%	13.6%	96.8%	3.2%
218.17	3,673	84.2%	15.8%	98.5%	1.5%
218.20	4,209	72.0%	28.0%	99.6%	0.4%
218.21	5,258	65.3%	34.7%	95.1%	4.9%
218.22	3,704	83.5%	16.5%	95.8%	4.2%

TABLE 6.10-16 (CONTINUED)
ETHNIC AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS:
PROJECT REGION AND WITHIN 6 MILES OF PROPOSED PROJECT

Jurisdiction/Census Tract Number	Total Population, 2000	White Population (%)	Minority Population (%)	Individuals Above Federal Poverty Level (%)	Individuals Below Federal Poverty Level (%)
218.23	3,236	79.4%	20.6%	97.7%	2.3%
218.24	2,884	82.9%	17.1%	97.9%	2.1%
218.29	5,392	74.7%	25.3%	97.4%	2.6%
218.30	5,876	81.3%	18.7%	97.8%	2.2%
219.03	3,965	69.0%	31.0%	96.8%	3.2%
219.05	5,216	78.8%	21.2%	95.9%	4.1%
219.12	3,360	85.6%	14.4%	98.3%	1.7%
219.13	8,482	64.3%	35.7%	83.4%	16.6%
219.14	4,226	69.8%	30.2%	89.3%	10.7%
219.15	4,074	73.2%	26.8%	97.4%	2.6%
219.16	3,784	80.0%	20.0%	97.9%	2.1%
219.17	3,366	87.1%	12.9%	94.9%	5.1%
219.18	4,960	77.7%	22.3%	89.6%	10.4%
219.19	2,816	80.0%	20.0%	95.5%	4.5%
219.20	5,338	80.3%	19.7%	97.8%	2.2%
219.21	4,520	70.1%	29.9%	98.4%	1.6%
219.23	5,864	70.8%	29.2%	98.3%	1.7%
753.01	5,282	52.0%	48.0%	91.1%	8.9%
753.03	3,430	72.5%	27.5%	89.9%	10.1%
754.01	3,538	69.9%	30.1%	94.2%	5.8%
754.04	6,143	61.5%	38.5%	91.3%	8.7%
757.01	6,442	72.1%	27.9%	92.8%	7.2%
758.05	4,039	78.9%	21.1%	87.5%	12.5%
758.06	5,839	70.8%	29.2%	92.9%	7.1%
758.07	4,640	63.9%	36.1%	90.6%	9.4%
758.08	3,226	88.8%	11.2%	94.0%	6.0%
758.09	3,130	81.8%	18.2%	97.7%	2.3%
758.10	3,078	83.4%	16.6%	97.3%	2.7%
758.11	3,311	60.3%	39.7%	80.9%	19.1%
758.12	6,651	67.5%	32.5%	82.2%	17.8%
758.13	5,139	72.0%	28.0%	94.2%	5.8%

TABLE 6.10-16 (CONTINUED)
ETHNIC AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS:
PROJECT REGION AND WITHIN 6 MILES OF PROPOSED PROJECT

Jurisdiction/Census Tract Number	Total Population, 2000	White Population (%)	Minority Population (%)	Individuals Above Federal Poverty Level (%)	Individuals Below Federal Poverty Level (%)
758.14	3,384	63.6%	36.4%	96.5%	3.5%
758.15	5,026	80.3%	19.7%	94.7%	5.3%
758.16	3,577	62.6%	37.4%	88.5%	11.5%
759.01	4,461	69.4%	30.6%	88.1%	11.9%
759.02	6,825	72.4%	27.6%	87.5%	12.5%
760.00	8,752	64.5%	35.5%	88.5%	11.5%
761.01	5,264	64.1%	35.9%	92.9%	7.1%
761.02	6,924	64.4%	35.6%	92.9%	7.1%
761.03 ¹	8,639	42.1%	57.9%	86.9%	13.1%
762.01	5,448	74.8%	25.2%	92.6%	7.4%
762.02	5,689	71.2%	28.8%	91.5%	8.5%
762.04	5,360	61.1%	38.9%	80.9%	19.1%
762.05	6,228	68.3%	31.7%	88.4%	11.6%
762.06	4,448	79.2%	20.8%	89.5%	10.5%
762.08	4,773	78.1%	21.9%	89.8%	10.2%
863.01	6,930	52.5%	47.5%	87.1%	12.9%
863.03	4,546	64.8%	35.2%	95.0%	5.0%
863.04	4,532	63.8%	36.2%	93.6%	6.4%
863.05	3,730	70.8%	29.2%	96.2%	3.8%
863.06	3,570	65.8%	34.2%	90.9%	9.1%
864.02	5,336	53.8%	46.2%	86.5%	13.5%
864.04 ¹	6,217	48.1%	51.9%	84.9%	15.1%
864.05 ¹	6,699	46.0%	54.0%	81.7%	18.3%
864.06	4,019	57.8%	42.2%	89.8%	10.2%
864.07	5,957	57.5%	42.5%	91.4%	8.6%
865.01 ¹	4,748	42.2%	57.8%	75.8%	24.2%
865.02 ¹	6,678	38.6%	61.4%	78.2%	21.8%
866.01 ¹	9,872	38.8%	61.2%	79.0%	21.0%
866.02 ¹	6,177	40.1%	59.9%	82.1%	17.9%
867.01	8,598	53.8%	46.2%	89.3%	10.7%
867.02 ¹	6,646	41.4%	58.6%	81.8%	18.2%

TABLE 6.10-16 (CONTINUED)
ETHNIC AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS:
PROJECT REGION AND WITHIN 6 MILES OF PROPOSED PROJECT

Jurisdiction/Census Tract Number	Total Population, 2000	White Population (%)	Minority Population (%)	Individuals Above Federal Poverty Level (%)	Individuals Below Federal Poverty Level (%)
868.02	5,359	54.5%	45.5%	86.0%	14.0%
871.01 ¹	4,087	45.9%	54.1%	86.2%	13.8%
871.02 ¹	5,862	39.0%	61.0%	83.6%	16.4%
871.03	7,631	57.3%	42.7%	91.1%	8.9%
871.05	4,507	54.1%	45.9%	91.3%	8.7%
871.06 ¹	4,990	47.4%	52.6%	86.7%	13.3%
872.00	7,371	60.2%	39.8%	85.8%	14.2%
873.00 ¹	10,041	47.8%	52.2%	75.1%	24.9%
874.01	3,058	54.7%	45.3%	92.9%	7.1%
874.03	3,735	52.6%	47.4%	74.1%	25.9%
874.04 ¹	3,785	47.5%	52.5%	83.8%	16.2%
874.05 ¹	6,649	46.1%	53.9%	70.8%	29.2%
875.01 ¹	5,950	39.1%	60.9%	74.1%	25.9%
875.03 ¹	7,110	47.3%	52.7%	80.3%	19.7%
875.04 ¹	8,248	47.6%	52.4%	71.3%	28.7%
876.01 ¹	5,157	49.0%	51.0%	86.5%	13.5%
876.02	7,354	54.6%	45.4%	84.4%	15.6%
877.01	4,882	56.6%	43.4%	93.0%	7.0%
877.04	4,734	54.7%	45.3%	91.6%	8.4%
883.01	5,991	56.0%	44.0%	89.9%	10.1%
883.02	5,230	63.9%	36.1%	95.7%	4.3%
884.01	4,903	56.8%	43.2%	90.9%	9.1%
884.02 ¹	4,896	48.9%	51.1%	86.2%	13.8%
884.03 ¹	6,514	47.2%	52.8%	89.2%	10.8%
885.02 ¹	5,023	47.0%	53.0%	83.4%	16.6%
891.02 ¹	6,954	46.4%	53.6%	91.9%	8.1%
891.07 ¹	5,710	41.2%	58.8%	92.1%	7.9%
Census Tracts Within Los Angeles County					
4033.25 ¹	4,684	41.4%	58.6%	95.0%	5.0%
4087.03 ¹	6,912	16.3%	83.7%	95.0%	5.0%

TABLE 6.10-16 (CONTINUED)
ETHNIC AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS:
PROJECT REGION AND WITHIN 6 MILES OF PROPOSED PROJECT

Jurisdiction/Census Tract Number	Total Population, 2000	White Population (%)	Minority Population (%)	Individuals Above Federal Poverty Level (%)	Individuals Below Federal Poverty Level (%)
Total of Census Tracts Within 6-Mile Radius	753,952	62.6%	37.4%	89.2%	10.8%
Orange County, Total	2,846,289	64.8%	35.2%	89.8%	10.2%
Los Angeles County, Total	9,519,338	48.7%	51.3%	82.4%	17.6%

Source: 2000 Census.

¹ Census tract identified as consisting of a minority population greater than 50 percent.

Department of Health and Human Services, 2000), as presented in Table 6.10-17. Census tract data in Table 6.10-16 and Figure 6.10-2 indicate that no census tracts within the EJ project area have low-income populations exceeding the 50 percent threshold.

TABLE 6.10-17
FEDERAL POVERTY THRESHOLDS¹

Size of Family	Poverty Threshold
1	\$8,350
2	\$11,250
3	\$14,150
4	\$17,050
5	\$19,950
6	\$22,850
7	\$25,750
8	\$28,650

¹ Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2000 Poverty Guidelines.

Orange County and Los Angeles County have poverty populations at 10.2 percent and 17.6 percent, respectively. The total percentage of individuals living in poverty within the EJ project area is 10.8 percent, which is 0.6 percent greater than Orange County. This difference is quite small; therefore, this analysis determines that the poverty population within the EJ project area is not “meaningfully greater” than the project region.

As a result, this analysis concludes that no poverty populations occur which: 1) exceed the 50 percent threshold within the EJ project area; and 2) are considered meaningfully greater than the project region.

6.10.3.1.4 Evaluation of Disproportionate Impacts. The final criteria used to determine whether the proposed project may potentially result in impacts related to environmental justice is the assessment of whether the potential environmental impacts attributable to the CPP project would fall disproportionately on the low-income or minority populations. According to the *Guidance*, “it is important to understand where such communities are located and how the lives and livelihoods of the members of these communities may be impacted by the proposed and alternative actions.” This is because “minority and low-income populations are likely to be dependent upon their surrounding environment (i.e., subsistence living), more susceptible to pollution and environmental degradation (e.g., reduced access to health care), and are often less mobile or transient than other populations.”

The following addresses typical environmental justice concerns for a project of this nature with respect to air quality, housing, noise, public health, public service impacts, traffic, and water quality.

Air Quality. The facility’s design will incorporate air pollution control measures designed to meet Best Available Control Technology (BACT) standards required by the State and South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). As evaluated in detail in Section 6.2, Air Quality, of this Application for Certification (AFC), the project would not emit significant emissions of criteria pollutants that could lead to health effects in the project vicinity.

Housing. As discussed in Section 6.10.2.2, the project expects that given the available workforce in the project region, most if not all of the required workforce during construction and operation would commute to the area rather than relocate. As a result, impacts to housing are expected to be negligible. Additionally, because of the availability of hotel/motel accommodations and the project region, workers who choose to relocate temporarily would not be expected to have a significant impact on housing availability.

Noise. The CPP finds that the construction of the proposed project would result in no significant noise or health impacts at the residences. During operation, the CPP project design would result in no noise impact to residential receptors. Further details pertaining to noise are discussed in Section 6.12, Noise.

Public Health. The project will not result in significant emission of toxic air contaminants that could increase the ambient cancer risk or result in non-cancer health effects above established thresholds (Section 6.16, Public Health).

Traffic. As discussed in Section 6.11 Traffic and Transportation, the proposed project would result in no significant impact to affect the transportation needs of the public.

Water Quality. The project will not involve wastewater discharges that could affect drinking water supplies (Section 6.5, Water Resources).

6.10.3.1.5 Summary of Environmental Justice Analysis. As previously discussed, no minority or poverty populations occur which: 1) exceed the 50 percent threshold within the EJ project area; and 2) are considered meaningfully greater than the project region. Furthermore, the proposed project would not result in potential environmental impacts having the likelihood of impacting populations more susceptible to pollution, environmental degradation, and transportation. In summary, this analysis concludes that the proposed project would not result in environmental justice impacts.

6.10.4 Cumulative Impacts

The potential for cumulative socioeconomic impacts exists where other projects are proposed in the region, construction schedules overlap, and employment opportunities are created. Projects with overlapping construction schedules and/or operations could cumulatively result in a demand for labor that cannot be met by the project area labor pool, which could lead to an influx of non-local workers and their dependents. Consequently, this potential population increase could impact socioeconomic resources. In this document, refer to Section 6.18, Cumulative Impacts for discussion other proposed projects having the potential to result in cumulative socioeconomic impacts.

6.10.5 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts on socioeconomic conditions were identified, and therefore, no mitigation measures are proposed.

6.10.6 Applicable LORS

Table 6.10-18 summarizes the LORS applicable to the socioeconomic impacts of the CPP.

6.10.6.1 Federal

6.10.6.1.1 Executive Order 12250. As discussed in Section 6.10.4, EO 12250 requires federal agencies to adopt disparate impact regulations, where a minority community may claim a “disparate impact” when it can demonstrate unique, different, and negative effects resulting from the state’s permitting agency. Refer to Section 6.10.3 for environmental justice concerns related to the CPP.

6.10.6.1.2 Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations. As discussed in Section 6.10.3, in 1994, President Clinton signed EO 12898, which requires federal governmental agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations. This EO establishes the framework for federal agencies to enforce health and environmental statutes in areas with low-income and minority populations, ensure greater public

**TABLE 6.10-18
APPLICABLE LORS**

LORS	Applicability	Conformance (Section)
Federal		
Executive Order 12250	Federal agencies to adopt disparate impact regulations, where a minority community may claim a "disparate impact" when it can demonstrate unique, different, and negative effects resulting from the state's permitting agency.	6.10.3.1.1
Executive Order 12898	Agencies are required to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and low income populations.	6.10.3
State		
California Constitution, Article 13, Section 3(b)	Property owned by a local government (except those that are outside of its boundaries), are exempt from property taxes.	6.10.2.7.1
Government Code Sections 65302 et seq.	Each city and county is required to develop a General Plan to guide planning and development within a jurisdiction.	6.10.7.3
Government Code Sections 65995-65997 (Education Code Section 17620)	Includes provisions for levies against development projects in school districts.	6.10.2.7.3 (not applicable to CPP)
Local	None Identified	

participation, improve research and data collection, and identify differential patterns of consumption of natural resources among low-income and minority populations (EO 12898, 1994). The CEC's data adequacy requirement requires analysis of environmental justice concerns associated with projects under its permitting jurisdiction. Refer to Section 6.10.4 for environmental justice concerns related to the CPP.

6.10.6.2 State

6.10.6.2.1 California Constitution, Article 13 Taxation, Section 3(b). Property owned by a local government (except those that are outside of its boundaries), are exempt from property taxes.

6.10.6.2.2 Government Code Sections 65995-65997 and Education Code Sections 17620-17626. In the event that new development impacts schools to the extent of requiring new construction or reconstruction, Government Code sections 65995-65997 and Education Code sections 17620-17626 give governing boards the authority to collect developer fees for residential, commercial, and industrial development within a school district.

The proposed project is located within the Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District. Because the CPP is a city-owned public utility, the school district has waived developer fees from the project.

6.10.6.2.3 Government Code Sections 65300-65303.4. California State Planning Law (Government Code Sections 65300-65303.4) requires that each city and county adopt a General Plan, consisting of seven mandatory elements, to guide planning and development within the jurisdiction.

6.10.6.3 Local

No LORS have been identified which are considered to be directly applicable to socioeconomic issues for the CPP.

6.10.7 Involved Agencies and Agency Contacts

Various public service agencies were contacted in the course of the socioeconomic investigation to check on levels of activity and expected impacts of the project. Table 6.10-19, Involved Agencies and Contacts, lists those agencies.

**TABLE 6.10-19
INVOLVED AGENCIES AND CONTACTS**

Subject	Agency	Contact/Title	Telephone
Education	Placentia-Yorba Linda School District	Julio Alvarez, Facilities and Planning	(714) 985.8770
Fire Protection Services	COA Fire Department	Bob Logue, Administrative Chief	(714) 765.4000
Fiscal Resources	California Board of Equalization (BOE)	Song Lee, Power Facilities Assessment	(916) 445.4982
Fiscal Resources	California Board of Equalization (BOE)	Rose Marie Kinnee, Legislative Division	(916) 445.6777
Fiscal Resources	County of Orange Assessor's Office	General	(714) 834.2727
Law Enforcement	East Anaheim Police Station	Sergeant Rick Martinez	(714) 765.3800 (714) 765.1521
Planning Services	COA Planning Department	General	(714) 765.5153
Sanitary System	COA Public Works Department	Jamie Lai, Principal Civil Engineer	(714) 765.1000

6.10.8 Applicable Permits, Permit Schedule, and Fees

Table 6.10-20 summarizes the socioeconomic permits and fees applicable to the CPP. As shown, there are no applicable permits or fees required related to socioeconomic resources.

**TABLE 6.10-20
APPLICABLE SOCIOECONOMIC PERMITS AND FEES**

Jurisdiction	Potential Permit and Fee Requirements
Federal	No permits or fees have been identified
State	No permits or fees have been identified
Local	No permits or fees have been identified

6.10.9 References

Alvarez, Julio. 2007. Placentia-Yorba Linda School District. Personal communication with J. Wu. (URS Corporation).

Anaheim Memorial Hospital. 2007. <http://www.memorialcare.org/>.

California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Units. 2007. California Public Schools – District Report.

California Department of Finance Economic Research Unit. 2000. California Statistical Abstract 2000.

2007. E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2007, with 2000 Benchmark. Sacramento, California, May 2007. California Department of Housing and Community Development. Raising the Roof, California's Housing Development Projections and Constraints, 1997-2020. Chapter 2: California Housing Production Needs, 1997-2020. May 2000.

California State Employment Development Department (EDD), Labor Market Division. 2007. Website: <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/> Occupational Employment Projections, 2004-2014:

- Orange County.
- Los Angeles County.
- Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario MSA.

California Statistical Abstract. 2005. Issued January 2006. Website: www.dof.ca.gov.

City of Anaheim. 2007. Website: <http://www.anaheim.net>.

2004. City of Anaheim General Plan/Zoning Code Update Final Environmental Impact Report. May 25, 2004.

Clark, Whitney. 2007. Los Angeles County Convention Center and Visitors Bureau. Personal communication with J. Wu (URS Corporation).

County of Orange, Auditor-Controller. 2006. Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), June 2006. <http://www.ac.ocgov.com/finstm2006.asp>

Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI). 1982. "Socioeconomic Impacts of Power Plants."

Fullerton School District, Office of the Superintendent. 2007. Personal communication with J. Wu (URS Corporation).

Kinnee, Rose Marie. 2007. California Board of Equalization (BOE). Personal communication with J. Wu (URS Corporation).

Lee, Song. 2007. California Board of Equalization (BOE). Personal communication with J. Wu (URS Corporation).

Logue, Bob. 2007. City of Anaheim Fire Department. Personal communication with J. Wu (URS Corporation).

Martinez, Rick. 2007. East Anaheim Police Station. Personal communication with J. Wu (URS Corporation).

Placentia Linda Hospital. 2007. <http://www.placentialinda.com/>.

PKF Consulting. 2007 Southern California Lodging Forecast. Internet location: http://www.csupomona.edu/~cshm/documents/pdi/PKF_Consulting.pdf

Scoll, J.P. 2003. Environmental Justice in California Power Plant Siting. Environmental Law News, Vol. 12, Number 3.

Southern California Association of Governments. 2007. Website: <http://www.scag.ca.gov/>.

State of California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division. 2007. Report 400 C.

Treasurer Tax Collector (TTC) 2007. Orange County, California. Website: <http://www.ttc.ocgov.com/treas/index.asp>

U.S. Census Bureau. 1990. Table DB-1. General Population and Housing Characteristics: 1990 Summary Table File 1 (STF 1) – 100-Percent Data. Geographic Areas:

- City of Anaheim, California.
- County of Los Angeles, California.

- County of Orange, California.
- County of Riverside, California.
- County of San Bernardino, California.

2000a. Table DB-1. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000; Geographic Areas:

- Multiple Census Tracts in Los Angeles County, California.
- Multiple Census Tracts in Orange County, California.

2000b. Table DB-3. Profile of Selected Economic Characteristics: 2000; Geographic Area: Multiple Census Tracts in Los Angeles County, California.

- Multiple Census Tracts in Los Angeles County, California.
- Multiple Census Tracts in Orange County, California.

2006. American Community Survey. Selected Housing Characteristics: 2006; Geographic Areas:

- California.
- City of Anaheim.
- County of Orange.
- County of Los Angeles.
- County of Riverside.
- County of San Bernardino.

2007. American Fact Finder. <http://factfinder.census.gov>.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2000. Poverty Guidelines.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1998. Final Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA's NEPA Compliance Analyses.

Western Medical Center. 2007. Website: <http://www.westernmedanaheim.com/>.

Wu, Joanne. 2007. City of Anaheim Public Works Department. Personal communication with J. Wu (URS Corporation).