

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
8.8 SOCIOECONOMICS	8.8-1
8.8.1 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	8.8-1
8.8.1.1 Economy: Labor Force, Employment and Income	8.8-1
8.8.1.1.1 Colusa and Glenn Counties (Colusa–Glenn)	8.8-1
8.8.1.1.2 Immediate Project Vicinity	8.8-2
8.8.1.1.3 Yuba Metropolitan Statistical Area	8.8-2
8.8.1.1.4 Sacramento Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area	8.8-3
8.8.1.1.5 Construction Employment	8.8-4
8.8.1.2 Population and Housing	8.8-4
8.8.1.2.1 Colusa and Glenn Counties	8.8-4
8.8.1.2.2 Immediate Project Vicinity	8.8-5
8.8.1.2.3 Yuba Metropolitan Statistical Area	8.8-5
8.8.1.2.4 Sacramento Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area	8.8-6
8.8.1.3 Public Services and Utilities	8.8-7
8.8.1.3.1 Fire Protection and Emergency Response	8.8-7
8.8.1.3.2 Law Enforcement	8.8-7
8.8.1.3.3 Schools	8.8-7
8.8.1.3.4 Medical Facilities	8.8-8
8.8.1.3.5 Utilities	8.8-8
8.8.1.4 Public Finance and Fiscal Issues	8.8-8
8.8.2 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	8.8-9
8.8.2.1 Significance Criteria	8.8-9
8.8.2.2 Discussion of Assumptions and Selected Impacts	8.8-9
8.8.2.3 Economic Impacts	8.8-10
8.8.2.4 Population and Housing Impacts	8.8-13
8.8.2.5 Public Services and Utilities	8.8-14
8.8.2.5.1 Fire Protection and Emergency Response	8.8-14
8.8.2.5.2 Law Enforcement	8.8-14
8.8.2.5.3 Schools	8.8-14
8.8.2.5.4 Medical Facilities	8.8-15
8.8.2.5.5 Utilities	8.8-15
8.8.2.6 Fiscal Impacts	8.8-16
8.8.3 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE	8.8-17
8.8.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	8.8-18
8.8.5 MITIGATION MEASURES	8.8-18
8.8.6 LAWS, ORDINANCES, REGULATIONS, AND STANDARDS	8.8-18
8.8.7 INVOLVED AGENCIES AND AGENCY CONTACTS	8.8-19
8.8.8 PERMITS REQUIRED AND PERMIT SCHEDULE	8.8-19
8.8.9 REFERENCES	8.8-19

TABLES

Table 8.8-1	Ten Leading Commodities in Colusa County, 2005
Table 8.8-2	Labor Force, Employment and Industry, Colusa County and Glenn County
Table 8.8-3	Labor Force, Employment and Industry, Yuba Metropolitan Statistical Area
Table 8.8-4	Labor Force, Employment and Industry, Sacramento Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area

Table 8.8-5	Population Trends and Projections
Table 8.8-6	Housing, 2006
Table 8.8-7	Maxwell Unified School District Enrollment
Table 8.8-8	Colusa County Allocation of Property Taxes, Fiscal Year 2006-2007
Table 8.8-9	Construction Employment
Table 8.8-10	Maximum Number of Workers, by Craft
Table 8.8-11	Permanent Employment, Colusa Generating Station
Table 8.8-12	Pipeline Construction Staff by Trade
Table 8.8-13	Temporary Housing Availability Near the Proposed Project
Table 8.8-14	Gravity Model — Operation Employees
Table 8.8-15	Race and Poverty Data

FIGURES

Figure 8.8-1	Socioeconomic Focus Area
Figure 8.8-2	Public Health, Race, and Poverty by Census Tract within a 6-Mile Radius of the Proposed Project

8.8 SOCIOECONOMICS

Socioeconomic issues relevant to the evaluation of environmental impacts include labor force, employment, and income; population and housing; public finance and fiscal issues; schools; and public services, and utilities (including fire protection, emergency response services, law enforcement, schools, medical services, and utilities).

8.8.1 Affected Environment

This section describes existing economic and demographic conditions at varying geographic levels. Information is presented for Colusa and Glenn counties as one study area (Colusa–Glenn), with an emphasis on Colusa County, the project’s location. Information is then presented for the project site followed by information for the Yuba Metropolitan Statistical Area (YMSA) and the Sacramento Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (SCMSA).¹ The socioeconomic focus area is shown on Figure 8.8-1.

8.8.1.1 Economy: Labor Force, Employment and Income

8.8.1.1.1 Colusa and Glenn Counties (Colusa–Glenn)

The project site is located approximately 1.5 miles south of the Colusa–Glenn county border, in Colusa County. Colusa County is bordered on the south by Yolo County, the west by Lake County, the north by Glenn County, and the east by Butte and Sutter counties.

Colusa County Agricultural Industry

Colusa County’s economy is based primarily on agricultural activities, and most of the agricultural production grown in the county is exported (CCCC, 2006a). Colusa County’s croplands encompass more than 331,000 acres (CCDA, 2006). Leading commodities in Colusa County in 2005 are shown in Table 8.8-1. Colusa County is a leading rice-producing county, as well as a leader in advanced rice-growing technological development, according to the County’s Chamber of Commerce. In 2006, 136,400 acres were devoted to rice cultivation (CCDA, 2006).

Colusa–Glenn Economy

The industries with the highest employment in Colusa–Glenn in 2005 were farming and government. In 2005, the labor force in Colusa–Glenn was 21,720, and had increased by approximately 8 percent since 1995. Construction, natural resources and mining employment in Colusa–Glenn in 2005 was approximately 585. (Table 8.8-2; EDD, 2006a and 2006b). According to the Chamber of Commerce, work sites in Colusa County can draw workers from a 75-mile radius (CCCC, 2006b), an area that would include the YMSA and the SCMSA.

The civilian unemployment rate in Colusa–Glenn was approximately 10 percent in 2005, 7 percentage points less than the area’s 1995 rate and double the state’s rate of 5 percent in 2005 (EDD, 2006c). Employment levels vary considerably over the year, due to the importance of the agricultural sector in the economy and the accompanying seasonal employment typical of this industry. This variability affects the number of unemployed, and results in a labor surplus during parts of the year. For example, the average annual unemployment rate in Colusa County in 2005 was 12 percent, but ranged from 7 percent in September and October to 21 percent in January (EDD, 2006d).

¹ General population information is also presented for the peripheral counties of Tehama and Butte.

Between 2001 and 2008, employment in Colusa–Glenn is expected to grow by approximately 14 percent, for an average annual rate of 2 percent. Industries anticipated to grow the most over this period are construction and mining. Construction and mining employment is anticipated to grow by 49 percent, an average annual rate of 7 percent (EDD, 2006e and 2006f).

In 2004, wage and salary disbursements in Colusa–Glenn were \$452 million. The average wages per job were \$27,340. Total personal income in 2004 was approximately \$566 million in Colusa County, and \$632 million in Glenn County. Per capita income in 2004 was \$27,701 in Colusa County and \$23,012 in Glenn County (BEA, 2006).

The number of business establishments in 2004 in Colusa County was 377. Approximately 38 percent of these were service establishments. All but 2 businesses had fewer than 250 employees, and most had fewer than 50 employees (USCB, 2006f). Glenn County had 498 business establishments in 2004 (USCB, 2006f). During high farming season, which coincides with tourist season, Colusa–Glenn becomes more active, and businesses experience higher revenues due to the influx of farm workers and tourists, and related demands for services, food, and temporary lodging.

Delevan, the small settlement closest to the project site at 4 miles east of the site, includes a rice dryer and grain warehouse. Sites, a small settlement 5 miles southwest of the project site, is comprised of a sand and gravel quarry operation (Johanns, 2006).

8.8.1.1.2 Immediate Project Vicinity

The project site encompasses 100 acres directly west of the existing PG&E Delevan Compressor Station. The power plant complex would be located on approximately 31 of the 100 acres, 466 feet west of the compressor station. PG&E employs a small number of workers for maintenance and other intermittent duties at the compressor station. The project site is currently rangeland. Cattle graze on the site periodically throughout the year. Economic activity in the immediate vicinity of the project site includes employment, related income, and spending at the PG&E Compressor Station, as well as the economic activity associated with cattle grazing (Johanns, 2006).

Land within approximately 3 miles of the site is used for farming (rice, wheat, or row crops) or for grazing. Beyond this area, the business closest to the site is Emerald Farms, located where the Glenn–Colusa Canal meets McDermott Road, approximately 3.5 miles southeast of the site. The next closest retail and service center is located in the town of Maxwell. Maxwell’s town center, located approximately 7 miles southeast of the site along I-5, encompasses more than 20 square blocks, and offers services typical of a small community center: a grocery store, gas stations and restaurants (Martinez, 2006).

8.8.1.1.3 Yuba Metropolitan Statistical Area

The YMSA, including Yuba County and Sutter County, is located east and northeast of Colusa County. Incorporated cities within the YMSA include Live Oak and Yuba City in Sutter County, and Marysville and Wheatland within Yuba County.

In 2005, the industries with the highest employment in the YMSA were government and trade, the same top two industries as in the SCMSA. From 1995 to 2005, the fastest-growing industries were professional and business services, educational and health services, and government (see Table 8.8-3; EDD, 2006g).

In 2005, the civilian labor force consisted of approximately 67,000 persons in the YMSA. The labor force increased at an average annual rate of 1 percent between 1995 and 2005, a rate slightly lower than the SCMSA. The YMSA’s unemployment rate was approximately 5 percentage points lower than the

1995 YMSA rate of 16 percent, and substantially higher than state's rate of 5 percent (EDD, 2006g and 2006c).

Between 2001 and 2008, employment in the YMSA is expected to grow by approximately 13 percent, for an average annual rate of 2 percent. Industries expected to grow the most over this period are finance, transportation, and public utilities (EDD, 2006b and 2006i).

The YMSA had 2,500 people employed in the construction industry in 2005, which grew at an average annual rate of 5 percent between 2000 and 2005. Construction employment is expected to grow by 8 percent, or at an average annual rate of more than 1 percent, between 2001 and 2008 (EDD, 2006g and 2006i).

8.8.1.1.4 Sacramento Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area

The SCMSA includes the state capital city of Sacramento, approximately 72 miles southeast of the project site, and is the large metropolitan area closest to the project site. The SCMSA includes El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties, and the major cities of Auburn (El Dorado County), Placerville (Placer County), and Woodland (Yolo County).

The City of Sacramento is the capital of the State of California. Therefore, in addition to being a major employment center for northern California, Sacramento has a strong government sector. The military has also played an important part in the Sacramento area economy. Throughout the twentieth century, military activities at Mather Field, McClellan Air Force Base, and the Sacramento Army Depot have supported the Sacramento regional economy. Although military activity has declined, these three centers still serve the region as high technology, commercial, and mixed-use areas.

In 2005, the industries in the SCMSA with the highest employment were government (25.3 percent of employment) and trade, transportation, and utilities (16.8 percent of employment) (see Table 8.8-4). Construction was the fastest-growing industry in the between 1995 and 2005; construction employment almost doubled between 1995 and 2005 (EDD, 2006h).

The SCMSA's non-military labor force of approximately 1,020,000 in 2005 represented approximately 6 percent of the state's non-military labor force. The average annual increase in the SCMSA's labor force was 1.2 percent between 1995 and 2005. The SCMSA's unemployment rate was approximately 5 percent in 2005, equal to the state rate. The unemployment rate in the SCMSA has decreased since 1995, when it was approximately 7 percent (EDD, 2006h and 2006c).

Between 2002 and 2012, employment in the SCMSA is expected to grow by approximately 24 percent, for an average annual rate of approximately 2 percent. The construction and business sectors are anticipated to grow the most over this period. Construction employment is anticipated to grow by 31 percent, for an average annual increase of approximately 3.1 percent (EDD, 2006j).

In 2004, personal income in the SCMSA was \$67 million, and per capita income was \$33,338. Personal income in the SCMSA accounted for approximately 5 percent of total state personal income. The per capita income in the SCMSA was 95 percent of the per capita income for the state as a whole (BEA, 2006).

The City of Chico, located in Butte County, is the closest large city to the project site. Butte County had a non-military labor force of 99,300 in 2005, and an unemployment rate of 6.5 percent. The sectors with the highest employment in 2005 were government (17 percent), and trade, transportation, and utilities (15 percent). Total employment in 2005 was 92,800 (EDD, 2006k).

8.8.1.1.5 Construction Employment

Construction employment in the Colusa-Glenn area, the YMSA, and the SCMSA was more than 75,000 workers in 2005. Based on 2005 unemployment rates for the areas, approximately 3,700 of these workers would be unemployed on average (EDD, 2006a, 2006b, 2006g, 2006h). The list of unions in the Yuba and Sacramento area below gives an indication of the categories into which construction workers fall:

- Boilmakers Local #3
- Carpenters Local #46
- Cement Masons Local #400
- Drywall/Lathers Local #109L
- Electrical Workers Local #340
- Iron Workers Local #118
- Laborers Local #67
- Laborers and Hod Carriers Local #185
- Machinist and Mechanics Local #2182
- Millmen Local #1618
- Millwrights Local #102
- Operating Engineers Local #3
- Painters Local #487
- Plasterers and Cement Masons Local #300
- Plumbers and Pipefitters Local #447
- Stationary Engineers Local #39
- Teamsters Local #150

The Sacramento Building and Construction Trades Council (serving Sacramento, Yolo, Amador, Nevada, Placer, El Dorado, and Sierra counties) and the Mid Valley Building and Construction Trades Council for the Colusa-Glenn area (serving Colusa, Glenn, Sutter, Yuba, Plumas, and Butte counties) have approximately 30,000 to 33,000 members, who generally fall into the craft categories related to the list of unions, above (Conley, 2006 and Steelman, 2006). E&L Westcoast has met with officials of the State Building Trades Council and an organization representing power plant construction and operator unions, California Unions for Reliable Energy (CURE), who have assured E&L Westcoast that there is sufficient skilled labor available to construct the project in the proposed time frame.

8.8.1.2 Population and Housing

8.8.1.2.1 Colusa and Glenn Counties

The population of Colusa–Glenn was approximately 48,885 in 2005, with 57 percent of residents living in Glenn County. The total population in 2005 represented less than 0.5 percent of the state population (USCB, 2006e). In the decade 2010 to 2020, Colusa–Glenn is expected to grow 12.5 percent per year, on average, slightly higher than the state’s rate of 11.7 percent for 2010 to 2020 (DOF, 2006a). See Table 8.8-5 for historical and projected population of Colusa–Glenn.

In 2000, less than half of the population in Colusa–Glenn resided in the incorporated cities. Unincorporated Glenn County was home to 14,741 residents, 32 percent of the total population in Colusa–Glenn. The population in unincorporated Colusa County was 10,295 (CICG, 2006a and 2006b). In 2004, cities in Colusa County include Colusa, population 5,855, and Williams, population 4,037. The Glenn County incorporated areas include Willows, population 6,299, and Orland, population 6,601 (USCB, 2006a).

Unincorporated towns in Colusa County include Stonyford, Lodoga, Leesville, Sites, Delevan, Lambertsville, Princeton, Maxwell, Grimes, Arbuckle, College City, and Millers Landing. Delevan, the small settlement closest to the project site at 4 miles east of the site, was comprised of approximately 10 homes in 1989 (CCGP, 1989). Delevan remains a very small community comprised of only a few buildings. Maxwell is approximately 7 miles southeast of the site, also along the Interstate 5 corridor. (Johanns, 2006).

The City of Willows is located 18 miles north (by road) of the project site in Glenn County. The cities of Williams and Colusa are located 19 miles south and 23 miles southeast of the site (by road), respectively (DOF, 2001a). Sites, a small settlement 5 miles southwest of the project site, is comprised of a few homes (CCGP, 1989; Johanns, 2006).

In 2006, Colusa–Glenn contained approximately 18,109 housing units, including 74 percent single-family homes, 13 percent multi-family homes, and 13 percent mobile homes. The vacancy rate at that time was 8.9 percent (Table 8.8-6; DOF, 2006e).

According to the Colusa County General Plan and a Colusa County Planner, Kent Johanns, projected population for 2010 in the county is 23,500 assuming housing increases are 120 to 150 units per year. In 1989, Maxwell contained about 310 single-family homes, 20 multi-family units, and a 26-space mobile home park (CCGP, 1989; Johanns, 2006).

Colusa County has approximately 550 hotel or motel rooms, with the majority of hotels located in the City of Williams (Jukusky, 2006). Average occupancy is 75 percent, not including the approximately 100 migrant farm workers who stay in the area during planting and harvesting periods (Holiday Inn Williams, 2006; Jukusky, 2006). Applying the 75 percent occupancy rate to 450 remaining rooms at high farming season, approximately 112 rooms would be available. Approximately 212 rooms would be available were no migrant farm workers staying in area hotel or motel rooms. In Glenn County, the City of Willows has at least 265 hotel rooms available (Roadside, 2006).

8.8.1.2.2 Immediate Project Vicinity

The residential use closest to the project site is located approximately 1.7 miles southeast of the site, at a location with two single-family homes and one barn-type structure used to store equipment. The next closest residences are two single-family residential homes located approximately 2.3 miles north and northwest of the site, respectively. Three mobile homes are located along McDermott Road, between 2 and 2.5 miles southeast of the site (Johanns, 2006).

The County's General Plan indicates that four registered private farmworker labor camps exist in Colusa County, with a capacity of 70 persons total. A 100-unit state-operated camp located outside of Williams houses 250 people seasonally (CCGP, 1989; Johanns, 2006).

8.8.1.2.3 Yuba Metropolitan Statistical Area

Population in the YMSA was approximately 161,277 in 2006. Similar to the state's growth rate during the same period, population has grown at an average annual rate of 2.2 percent between 1980 and 2006. The percentage of state population residing within the YMSA has remained at approximately 0.4 percent between 1980 and 2006. Approximately 52 percent of the YMSA population lived in incorporated areas in 2006 (DOF, 2006h and 2006a).

The largest cities in the YMSA include Yuba (Sutter County), with a population of 60,507 in 2006, and Marysville (Yuba County), with a population of 12,591 in 2006 (DOF, 2006e).

Anticipated population growth for the YMSA during the period 2000 to 2030 is an average annual rate of 1.5 percent, similar to the rate of growth between 1980 and 2000. The YMSA is anticipated to grow faster than the state during this period (DOF, 2006a). See Table 8.8-5 for historical and projected population in the YMSA.

In 2006, the YMSA contained approximately 59,103 housing units, comprised of 74 percent single family homes, 16 percent multi-family homes, and 9 percent mobile homes. The vacancy rate was 7 percent in 2006 (Table 8.8-6; DOF, 2006e).

The total number of hotel or motel rooms in Sutter and Yuba counties is approximately 529. Most of the rooms are located in Marysville and Yuba City (Roadside, 2006). Yuba and Sutter counties also have approximately two recreation vehicle parks (Greg, 2006; Cassi, 2006). The weekday occupancy rate is typically 65-75 percent (Metcalf, 2006).

8.8.1.2.4 Sacramento Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area

Population in the SCMSA was 2.07 million in 2006, and grew at an average annual rate of 3.3 percent between 1980 and 2006, 1 percent faster than statewide population growth. The percentage of state population residing within the SCMSA grew from 4 percent in 1980 to 5.6 percent in 2006. Approximately 60 percent of the population resided in incorporated areas in 2006 (DOF, 2006g; 2006a). Table 8.8-5 shows historical and projected population for the SCMSA.

Anticipated growth of the SCMSA during the period 2010 to 2020 is 25 percent, for an average annual rate of 2.5 percent, 1.3 percentage points faster than the state's projected average annual growth rate during the same period (DOF, 2006a). Table 8.8-5 shows historic and projected population trends in the SCMSA.

The City of Sacramento in Sacramento County, the largest city in the SCMSA, had a population of 457,514 in 2006. Citrus Heights (Sacramento County) and Roseville (Placer County) had populations of 86,883 and 104,655, respectively, in 2006. Davis (Yolo County), Folsom (Sacramento County), and Woodland (Yolo County) were home to 64,585, 69,445 and 52,972 residents, respectively, in 2006 (DOF, 2006e).

In 2006, the SCMSA contained more than 800,000 housing units. The housing stock consisted of 73 percent single-family homes, 24 percent multi-family homes, and 3 percent mobile homes. The vacancy rate at that time was 9 percent (see Table 8.8-6; DOF, 2006e). The Sacramento area contains more than 12,000 hotel rooms and 8 to 10 recreational vehicle parks (Devincenzi, 2006; Carr, 2006).

Butte and Tehama counties are located to the north and northeast of the project site, respectively. The City of Chico, in Butte County, has the largest population (79,091) in 2006 and is located approximately 38 miles northeast of the project site (DOF, 2006e). Chico has approximately 1,225 hotel rooms. During the week, the rooms are approximately 60 percent occupied, while on the weekends, the occupancy rate can reach 90 percent. Chico also has one recreational vehicle park with 44 spaces (Goeller, 2006).

The City of Corning, in Tehama County, is second in population size to the City of Red Bluff. Corning had a population of 7,220 in 2006. The cities of Oroville, Clearlake, and Davis are located in Butte, Lake and Yolo counties, respectively, and have 13,550, 13,921, and 64,585 residents in 2006, respectively. The typical occupancy rate is 87 percent (DOF, 2006e). Corning, Oroville, Clearlake, and Davis (39 miles, 47 miles, 57 miles, and 68 miles from the site, respectively) together have a total of 1,192 hotel rooms, 17 to 19 recreational vehicle parks, and one campground.

8.8.1.3 Public Services and Utilities

8.8.1.3.1 Fire Protection and Emergency Response

The fire and emergency services station closest to the project site is the Maxwell Rural Station, located at 231 West Oak in Maxwell, approximately 7.5 miles southwest of the site. The station is one of nine rural fire districts and two municipal fire departments that serve Colusa County. The Maxwell Rural Station serves a 130-square-mile area bordered on the north by the Glenn County line and on the south by Lurline Avenue, extending west to the settlement of Sites and east to encompass the Delevan National Wildlife Refuge. Maxwell Rural Station is responsible for structural and wildfire protection and medical emergencies within its boundaries. The California Department of Forestry and the U.S. Forest Service also provide fire protection to the county. Staff includes 25 volunteer firefighters. Equipment includes one Type I engine, two Type I/II engines, one Type III engine, one squad vehicle, and one large tanker (Bowen, 2006).

Other stations close to the site include the Princeton Rural Station, approximately 10 miles to the east, the rural fire districts of Williams and Colusa, approximately 10 miles to the south, and the municipal districts of Williams and Colusa, approximately 10 miles to the southeast, respectively. All stations within Colusa County have mutual aid agreements with each other (Bowen, 2006).

Ambulance and emergency medical services (including helicopter service) are provided to Colusa County by Enloe Ambulance, a private contractor. The closest Enloe ambulance crew is located in Williams; another crew is located in Colusa. Enloe helicopter service would originate in Chico (Bowen, 2006).

8.8.1.3.2 Law Enforcement

The Colusa County Sheriff's Department provides public safety and law enforcement services to the unincorporated areas of the County, including the project site. The headquarters are located at 929 Bridge Street in the City of Colusa, approximately 23 miles southeast of the site. Twenty-nine patrol officers cover an area of more than 1,000 square miles. Staff includes 39 sworn officers and 14 correctional officers. The jail within the department can accommodate up to 80 persons (Dickson, 2006).

Other law enforcement agencies within the county include the District Ranger for the Mendocino National Forest, and the Fish and Game Warden for the National Wildlife Refuges. In addition, the California Highway Patrol (CHP) operates on state roads in the county and maintains an office and vehicle yard in Williams, with 21 uniformed officers. The CHP provides traffic enforcement and accident investigations throughout the county (CCGP, 1989; Johanns, 2006).

8.8.1.3.3 Schools

The project site is located within the boundaries of the Maxwell Unified School District (MUSD), which includes Maxwell Elementary School (K-8), Maxwell High School, and Enid Prine High School. These schools are the schools closest to the site, and are located in the town of Maxwell, approximately 7 miles southeast of the project site. Enrollment in MUSD has decreased only slightly (at an average annual rate of 0.1 percent) between the 2002-2003 school year and the 2005-2006 school year, when total enrollment was 442. During those years, high school and elementary school enrollment decreased (Table 8.8-7; DOE, 2006). The Maxwell Unified School District charges owners of new commercial industrial development \$0.36 per square foot for covered and enclosed space (Wilson, 2006).

Currently, the Richter Group 18-unit subdivision in Maxwell is tentatively approved and construction is projected to begin in 2008-2009; no other subdivisions are currently approved for the town of Maxwell. Developers have expressed interest in creating housing developments within the area (Johanns, 2006).

MUSD will be able to accommodate the increased school enrollment resulting from the 18-unit subdivision. If a substantial housing development becomes approved within the school district's jurisdiction, MUSD will develop a management plan to accommodate the projected increase in population at the school district (Wilson, 2006).

MUSD is governed by the Colusa County Superintendent of Schools Office, which also oversees three other districts in the county: Colusa Unified, Pierce Joint Unified, and Williams Unified school districts. Two other districts in Colusa County, Stony Creek Joint Unified and Princeton Joint Unified, are governed by the Glenn County Superintendent of Schools Office. Total 2005-2006 enrollment in Colusa-Glenn was approximately 10,449 students. The YMSA includes 19 school districts and had 33,121 enrolled students during the 2005-2006 school year. The same year, the SCMSA's total enrollment (in 57 districts) was 361,560 students (DOE, 2006).

The City of Chico is located within Butte County, and is served by the Chico Unified School District. Chico Unified School District's 2005-2006 enrollment was 13,533 students (DOE, 2006).

Yuba Community College offers college preparation and vocational courses at its Center in the City of Colusa. The University of California (Davis), California State University (Sacramento), and California State University (Chico) are located within approximately 60 miles of Colusa County.

8.8.1.3.4 Medical Facilities

Facilities that provide medical services to the project site include Glenn General Hospital, Valley West Care Center, and Colusa Community Hospital. Glenn General Hospital is the closest to the site, located at 1133 West Sycamore Street in Willows, approximately 17 miles from the site. Valley West Care Center and Colusa Community Hospital are located 19 and 24 miles from the site, in Williams and Colusa, respectively. Colusa Community Hospital has 48 beds, 24-hour physician-staffed emergency care, maternity, home health, industrial medicine, and preventive medicine services (Chatell, 2006). Medical facilities near the project site are listed and described in more detail in Section 8.6, Public Health.

As stated in Section 8.8.1.3.1, Fire Protection and Emergency Response, ambulance service is provided by Enloe Ambulance, located both in Willows (17 miles from the site) and Colusa (24 miles from the site). Other health services provided include the Colusa County Department of Health and Human Services programs for women and children, drug and alcohol recovery, child protective services, crisis hotlines, and mental health and counseling (CCDHHS, 2006).

8.8.1.3.5 Utilities

Local telephone service is provided by Citizens Communications, and long-distance service is provided by 15 companies (CCC, 2006d). Cellular telephone coverage exists on the project site and is provided to Colusa County by Cingular, Nextel, and Verizon (Favila, 2001).

Potable water and a septic system are available at the PG&E Compressor Station. PG&E supplies electricity and natural gas to the project site vicinity. Non-hazardous solid waste is disposed of by Stonyford Disposal (Colusa County) and at the Maxwell Transfer Station (run by Colusa County).

8.8.1.4 Public Finance and Fiscal Issues

In 2000, total taxable sales in Colusa County were approximately \$222.6 million, and total taxable retail sales the same year were \$128.8 million.² Colusa County's taxable sales represented less than 1 percent

² 2000 figures were used as they were the most recent available from the Department of Finance.

of the state's taxable sales. The sales and use tax rate (includes state, local and district) is 7.25 percent (DOF, 2006b). Maxwell Unified School District does not have any outstanding (unpaid) school bonds (Dawley, 2006).

Colusa County's net assessed value was \$2.181 billion³ in fiscal year 2006. The Colusa County property tax rate is 1 percent on the assessed value of industrial, commercial, and residential property. The current assessed value of the 451-acre property that contains the 100-acre project site was \$244,918 in fiscal year 2006 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). During fiscal year 2005, Colusa County received \$2,479.96 in property tax revenue for the entire 451-acre property (Dawley, 2006). The project site represents about 22 percent of the total area of this property.

Other special assessment districts that levy taxes on the parcel where the project site is located include the Colusa Basin Drainage District, which charges \$0.10 per acre plus \$1 collection fee annually, and the Maxwell Park and Recreation District, which charges \$0.07 per acre plus \$1.00 annually. The Colusa Basin Drainage District received \$47.20, and the Maxwell Park and Recreation District received \$33.60 from the owner of this parcel in fiscal year 2006 (Dawley, 2006).

Colusa County property tax revenues are allocated as shown in Table 8.8-8. The funds that received the highest percentage allocations of the property tax revenue are the school districts (approximately one-third of total revenues), and local agencies countywide, including the general fund (more than one-quarter of revenues).

The majority of Colusa County's local revenue is from taxes, aid from the federal government, and current charges for services. Other local agencies with taxing powers include fire districts, cemeteries, school districts, and other special districts. The County does not project tax revenue beyond the current fiscal year (Dawley, 2006).

The total budget for Colusa County during fiscal year ending June 30, 2006 was \$50.5 million (Scroggin, 2006).

8.8.2 Environmental Consequences

8.8.2.1 Significance Criteria

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

- Induce substantial growth or concentration of population;
- Induce substantial increases in demand for public services and utilities;
- Displace a large number of people;
- Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community; or
- Result in substantial long-term disruptions to businesses.

8.8.2.2 Discussion of Assumptions and Selected Impacts

To the extent practicable, the Applicant has committed to give local preference in hiring and procurements. However, the assumptions in the socioeconomic impact analysis related to hiring labor and purchasing materials imply that the majority of labor and materials purchases would occur outside the

³ Net assessed value is the assessed value on which the County collects property taxes.

Colusa-Glenn area. The estimated *worst-case* assumptions are used for the purpose of approximating a conservative scenario under which socioeconomic impacts, including population and public services impacts, could be evaluated.

The most notable socioeconomic impact from the proposed project would be the substantial increase in the county's total assessed value for real estate and associated increase in annual county property tax revenues of approximately 8 to 10 percent over total current property tax revenues. After construction, as a utility asset the new power plant would pay an estimated \$1.575 to 2.0 million in annual property tax revenues, which would benefit local schools and the County general fund, as well as local service districts, as described in Section 8.8.2.5. This increased tax revenue could be used to contribute to the Colusa County General Plan goal of nurturing “the personal, academic, and professional growth of local residents” and to provide “social services that meet [residents’] needs at all stages in life” (CCGP, 1989).

The impacts from the proposed project would be consistent with the Community Character goals of the Colusa County General Plan, which include to preserve the “relaxed, pastoral atmosphere of Colusa County and its communities,” and to “conserve the county’s uncrowded, uncongested environment” (CCGP, 1989).

8.8.2.3 Economic Impacts

Construction

Construction of the power generation facility would last approximately 24 months. Construction employment would peak at approximately month 14 at 669 workers, including 621 craft workers and 48 contractor staff. Table 8.8-9 shows construction labor by month for the proposed project and Table 8.8-10 shows the maximum numbers of craftworkers who would be employed at any one time. The maximum number of workers for all trades would not occur simultaneously.

Peak construction employment would represent approximately 19 percent of construction jobs in the YMSA in 2005, and less than 1 percent of the same measure in the SCMSA. As stated in Section 8.8.2.2, to the extent practicable, the Applicant has committed to give a local preference to hiring. However, for the purpose of this analysis, it is projected that approximately 5 percent of the workforce would be hired from within Colusa–Glenn. Skilled laborers such as boilermakers, pipefitters, and electricians would most likely be hired from outside Colusa–Glenn and also outside the greater Sacramento area, but mostly from the San Francisco Bay Area. Boilermakers especially would come from the East Bay region. The Sacramento International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and United Association Trades would come from the greater Sacramento area. It is anticipated that remaining trades would be hired from within the greater Sacramento and Northern Valley areas.

When the estimated number of available construction workers (3,700, see Section 8.8.1.1.5) is evenly distributed among the unions listed in Section 8.8.1.1.5, none of the required craft categories for the proposed project’s construction would exceed labor availability by craft.

Given the substantial available construction labor force in the SCMSA, the supporting construction labor force in the YMSA (see Section 8.8.1.1.3), and the labor force in the Bay Area, it is expected that an adequate available labor force within daily or weekend commute distance would be found to supply the work force associated with construction of the proposed project. It is anticipated that approximately 60 percent of the workforce would commute daily (with commute times up to 1.5 hours) and the rest would be weekly commuters.

For purposes of this analysis, the cost of construction of the proposed plant is assumed to range from \$450 to \$500 million. The total payroll for construction of the proposed project is projected to range from

\$78.75 to \$87.5 million. The remaining cost of construction, \$371.25 to \$412.5 million, is the cost of equipment, materials, supplies, engineering, fees, insurance, taxes, administrative cost, and other direct costs. Gravel and concrete would be purchased within Colusa–Glenn. To the extent practicable, other building materials and supplies such as scaffolding, insulation, and paint would be purchased locally. Otherwise, these supplies would be purchased in the greater Sacramento area. The remaining materials (comprising approximately 90 percent of non-labor cost), including the turbines, would be purchased outside both areas.

Businesses in the local area surrounding the plant site might experience impacts due to construction nuisances (noise, dust, traffic). Since these are agricultural businesses, the construction nuisances would have a less-than-significant impact on their ability to conduct business activities. See Section 8.5, Noise, for information on noise impacts from construction. Although trucks would pass through business and populated areas, they would not likely disrupt employee or customer traffic or disturb local businesses, nor would they pass through business areas at hours other than daytime hours.

Indirect and Induced Economic Impacts from Construction

Construction activity would result in secondary economic impacts (indirect and induced impacts) that would occur within the Colusa–Glenn area, within the 10-county area including the YMSA, the SCMSA, and the peripheral counties of Tehama and Butte, and within the State of California.⁴ Secondary employment effects would include indirect employment due to the purchase of goods and services by firms involved with construction, and induced employment due to construction workers spending their income in their local area. Similarly, indirect and induced income and spending effects also occur as “ripple” effects from construction. Indirect and induced impacts were estimated using multipliers derived from IMPLAN economic modeling software and data specific to the study area.⁵

Estimated indirect and induced effects of construction would include an additional 174 to 228 jobs, \$78 to \$86 million in labor income, and approximately \$417 million to \$464 million in output.⁶

These impacts would be temporary, since they are attributable to temporary construction activities, and would lag behind the direct effects of construction by approximately 6 to 12 months. Most of these indirect and induced impacts would occur outside of the greater Sacramento area, because of the relatively high proportion of the total project cost that is attributable to supply purchasing and non-labor expenses projected to occur outside of the area.⁷

Operation

Operation and maintenance of the proposed project would require 31 skilled full-time production employees (see Table 8.8-11).

⁴ Tehama and Butte counties were included in the analysis of secondary impacts because in the analysis of population, it was determined that some construction workers could temporarily locate in cities in the two counties, and would therefore be spending a portion of their income there.

⁵ IMPLAN Professional Version 2.0, copyright Minnesota IMPLAN Group, 1997.

⁶ 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.

⁷ Although the Applicant has committed to local hiring, the IMPLAN model was based on the following worst-case assumptions: (1) 5 percent of the workers would originate from Colusa–Glenn, 45 percent from the greater Sacramento area (10-county area), and 50 percent from elsewhere. (2) The Applicant will spend 2 percent of the non-labor cost of construction within Colusa–Glenn, 10 percent within the greater Sacramento area (10-county area), and 88 percent elsewhere.

To the extent practicable, the Applicant has committed to give a local preference in hiring and procurements. However, for the purposes of evaluating a worst-case scenario, it is assumed for this analysis that the permanent employees would be hired from outside but would relocate to the Colusa–Glenn and greater Sacramento area,⁸ due to the necessary specialized skills for plant operation. Total operation payroll costs would be approximately \$3.15 million. Most of the labor income earned by production employees at the power plant would be spent in their place of residence, likely the 10-county area that includes Colusa–Glenn, YMSA, and the Sacramento SCMSA, Tehama County, and Butte County (see the discussion that follows in Section 8.8.2.4, Population and Housing Impacts). During operation an estimated \$50,000 associated with the project will be spent annually at local businesses. However, the daily commuters originating from outside Colusa–Glenn could spend a small portion of their income in Colusa–Glenn for items such as gasoline and food. This spending would have a limited effect because of the relatively small number of employees.

Indirect and Induced Economic Impacts from Operation

Similar to construction, operation of the proposed project would result in indirect and induced economic impacts that would occur within the Colusa–Glenn area; within the 10-county area (including the YMSA, the SCMSA, and the peripheral counties of Tehama and Butte); and within the State of California. Indirect and induced impacts were estimated using IMPLAN for each of the three areas. Unlike indirect and induced impacts from construction, indirect and induced impacts from operation would represent permanent increases in area economic variables, but would still lag behind direct effects by approximately 6 to 12 months.⁹

Estimated indirect and induced employment effects of annual operation that would occur within Colusa–Glenn would be an additional 8 to 11 permanent jobs. In the larger 10-county area, indirect and induced employment impacts in addition to those that would occur in Colusa–Glenn would be an additional 65 permanent jobs. Indirect and induced employment impacts outside of the 10-county area would include an additional estimated 1,006 worker-months.¹⁰ These employment effects would also generate economic benefits in labor income, business taxes, and total economic output both within and outside of the study region.

Electricity Transmission, Natural Gas Pipeline, and Water Supply Pipeline

Construction staff required for installation of the electricity transmission, natural gas pipeline, and water supply pipeline have all been incorporated into the construction staff estimates listed in Table 8.8-9. Construction of the natural gas pipeline to the proposed project would occur over a 5- to 6-week period during the power generation facility's construction. Pipeline construction would require a workforce of up to 10 staff in addition to the workforce required for construction of the power generation facility. The pipeline workforce would consist of laborers, welders, equipment operators, supervisory personnel, and construction management personnel. Table 8.8-12 shows the breakdown of trades for construction of the natural gas pipeline. A shortage in supply of construction workers for the construction of the natural gas

⁸ Includes Tehama and Butte counties.

⁹ Fuel costs were not included in the IMPLAN model because the prices for these costs are variable and unknown, and the spending would not occur in Colusa–Glenn or the 10-county area.

¹⁰ Although the Applicant has committed to hiring, the IMPLAN model for operation was based on the following worst-case assumptions: (1) most of the workers would originate from outside Colusa–Glenn. (2) 30 percent of the permanent employees would be located within Colusa–Glenn, and the remaining would locate outside of Colusa–Glenn, but inside the 10-county area. If local hiring and purchasing are higher than what was assumed, indirect and induced economic impacts to the local area, such as jobs and income, would also be higher.

pipeline would not likely occur, due to the worker availability discussed above in Economic Impacts (Construction).

Construction of the electricity transmission line, natural gas pipeline, and water supply line would not cause any disturbances because the areas where they would be constructed are primarily rangeland. Nuisance impacts to businesses would be similar to those identified for plant construction, discussed above.

Significant adverse economic impacts associated with the proposed project are not expected to occur. The local area, the surrounding region, and the state would experience economic benefits attributable to the proposed project in the form of direct, indirect, and induced employment and associated income; materials and supplies spending; and tax revenue.

8.8.2.4 Population and Housing Impacts

Construction

Construction of the project would not cause any substantial permanent population increases or changes in concentration of population due to the temporary nature of construction. Construction workers would be a temporary addition to the Colusa–Glenn population during the daytime, especially during the peak period, which would last approximately 4 months. Colusa–Glenn would also experience an increase in weekday overnight population due to weekly commuters. During the day, the workers would purchase food and gasoline in the area, and weekly commuters would purchase lodging in the 10-county area during the week.

Approximately 40 percent of the construction workforce would be weekly commuters, in that they would stay in temporary housing locations near the site Monday through Friday, and return home on the weekends. They would likely either stay in hotel or motel rooms, or bring their own recreational vehicles and stay in a recreational vehicle park. At peak construction activity approximately 268 workers would need temporary housing during the week. Table 8.8-13 shows estimates of availability of temporary housing in nearby areas.

An estimated 2,333 hotel rooms or recreational vehicle spaces would be available within approximately 1 hour of the plant site. It is also possible that construction workers could share rooms or recreational vehicle spaces to save per diem costs; therefore, it is likely that fewer than 268 rooms would be in demand during peak construction. The temporary influx of construction workers during the week is not expected to place demands on the local lodging industry that cannot be met.

Operation

For operation, a gravity model was used to estimate where the 31 employees who would work at the proposed plant would locate. A gravity model assigns weighted factors to cities, assuming that the attractiveness of a community increases with population size (a proxy for the type, quality and variety of amenities offered at that location), but decreases with distance from the place of employment. Based on information from the Applicant and experience with other plants, the gravity model was based on the assumption that 80 percent of production employees would reside within 40 miles of the proposed project. The results of the gravity model, shown in Table 8.8-14, indicate that more than 25 percent of the operation employees could locate in Colusa-Glenn. Almost half of the employees would likely locate in Chico, given its size and proximity to the site, and the rest would reside elsewhere.

The housing vacancy rates in these areas range from approximately 4 to 17 percent on average, and the number of housing units in Colusa–Glenn in 2006 was more than 18,000. It is not anticipated that the

employees would have difficulty finding housing within Colusa–Glenn or within reasonable commute distance in the greater Sacramento Area. The relocation of 31 workers and their families would not create a substantial increase in population that would lead to substantial increase in demand for public services. Were all 31 to locate within Colusa–Glenn, using 2.5 persons per household, an additional 78 people would be added to the population, representing 0.1 percent of the Colusa–Glenn population in 2006 (DOF, 2006f).

Impacts on population and housing in the SCMSA, the YMSA, and Colusa–Glenn associated with operation of the proposed project would be less than significant in relation to the population in communities where employees would locate.

8.8.2.5 Public Services and Utilities

8.8.2.5.1 Fire Protection and Emergency Response

As stated in Section 3.6.2.3, during construction and operation, emergency services would be coordinated with the local fire department and hospital. During construction, the Applicant would contact an urgent care facility to set up non-emergency physician referrals. Regularly maintained first-aid kits would be provided around the site. At least one person trained in first aid would be part of the construction staff, and fire extinguishers would be located throughout the construction site.

Prior to and during operation, a fire protection system would be provided on the project site by the Applicant. The systems would include a fire protection water system, carbon dioxide fire suppression systems for the CTGs, and portable fire extinguishers. For a detailed description of the onsite fire protection system, see Section 3.4.10. Public agencies would also provide fire protection. The public fire protection system, together with the onsite system, would be adequate to serve the proposed project during construction and operation (Bowen, 2006).

8.8.2.5.2 Law Enforcement

Onsite security would be provided by the Applicant to assist in law enforcement during project operation. The Colusa County Sheriff's Department would provide law enforcement services to the proposed project. The Colusa County Sheriff's Department would be able to adequately serve the additional population associated with project construction and operation (Dickson, 2006).

8.8.2.5.3 Schools

Schools would not experience any meaningful impact during construction, as the population increase would be temporary and would not likely involve school-age children. During operation, an anticipated 16 new students would be attending schools in the area, based on an average students-per-household number of 0.52.¹¹ Eleven of the 16 new students would attend primary and middle schools, and the other 5 students would attend high school. As a worst-case scenario, were all the additional students to attend schools in the Maxwell Unified School District, the increase attributable to the project would represent a possible 4 percent increase in student enrollment over the 2006-2007 school year enrollment. Since almost half of the operation workforce is expected to reside in Chico, the Chico Unified School District (CUSD) could experience an increase of approximately 6 students. This change is not significant when compared with CUSD 2005-2006 school year enrollment of 33,192 (DOE, 2006). The impact on schools of the additional population associated with proposed project operation would be less than significant.

¹¹ The estimated number of students per household was calculated for each county in Colusa–Glenn, the YMSA, and the SCMSA and averages among the three areas. The calculation was based on the number of housing units in each county in 2006, and the enrollment in each county during the 2005-2006 school year.

Based on an estimated 15,340 square feet of covered and enclosed space for the plant, the Maxwell Unified School District would charge the Applicant a one-time school impact fee of approximately \$5,522 for new industrial development (Dawley, 2006).

8.8.2.5.4 Medical Facilities

The medical facilities listed in Section 8.8.1.3.4 could accommodate the temporary increase in demand for services associated with the construction workforce. In addition, see Section 8.7 for a discussion of worker health and safety. The increase of approximately 31 employees would increase the demand for medical facilities in the greater Sacramento area in general. Since the number of employee families would be relatively small compared to the general population in the region, and their places of residence would likely be spread out over the region, no problem is anticipated in accommodating the slight additional demand for medical services. These impacts would be less than significant.

8.8.2.5.5 Utilities

Construction

During construction, the Applicant would provide temporary utility services for the offices, laydown area, and construction area. See Section 3.6.2.4 for more information. During construction, potable water would not initially be available at the site, so bottled water would be supplied for worker use. Construction water will be supplied by truck until the intake structure at the Tehama-Colusa Canal is constructed. Water will be used primarily for dust suppression. Average daily use of construction water is estimated to be approximately 8,000 gallons.

During construction, a temporary power source would be installed and toilet trailers and chemical toilets would be provided on site for sanitary purposes. Holding tanks for the toilet trailers and bathrooms of the office trailers would require periodic pumping.

Operation

Water for operation of the project would be supplied from the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District via the Tehama-Colusa Canal, and piped to the site via a new 2,700-foot 4-inch water supply pipeline. The sanitary wastewater system would collect sanitary wastewater from sinks, toilets, and other sanitary facilities and would discharge it to a septic tank served by a leach field.

Standard non-hazardous construction waste and debris would be disposed of in onsite dumpsters. Where practical, these wastes will be recycled. Non-hazardous wastes that are not recycled will be disposed of at a Class III landfill. Please see Section 8.13, Waste Management, and Section 3.4.7 for more information.

Stormwater runoff would be collected by a surface drainage system and directed to a 2.2 acre-foot stormwater detention basin. The flow of stormwater would generally follow the existing drainage pattern. See Section 3.5.7 for information about onsite storm water drainage.

The temporary increase in demand for utilities due to weekend-commuting construction workers could be met because they would either stay in available lodging, or in self-contained recreational vehicles. The increase in demand for utilities under operation could be met, as the number of new permanent residents in any particular community would be small. Impacts to utilities attributable to the proposed project would be less than significant.

8.8.2.6 Fiscal Impacts

After construction, the assessed value of the property may increase, as would the associated annual property tax revenues payable to the County; however, such increases are not proportional. Power plant valuation does not work the way it would for most other types of industrial development or improvements. Normally, any new development project would be assessed at its market value, and the County property tax rate of 1 percent would be applied to calculate the annual property tax bill, but valuation of power plants under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Equalization (BOE) are governed by a complex set of statutes. The California Constitution requires the BOE to assess utilities for property taxation purposes, although there have been a variety of changes over the past five years in the ways in which utilities are valued.

For PG&E, the BOE performs an annual valuation based on the unit concept. The unit valuation includes all properties owned or used by the utility in its utility operations. With the exception of land, the state then determines how values are allocated among the counties, based on Reproduction Cost New Less Depreciation (RCNLD). Typically, this results in “diluting” the value of a newly constructed plant—i.e., the amount of local property tax is less than it would be for other types of industrial facilities constructed in a particular location. For a plant such as the one proposed for construction in Colusa County, an experienced senior appraiser on BOE’s staff estimated that the amount allocated to the county where construction occurred would be approximately 35 to 40 percent of the amount actually spent to construct the plant (Thompson, 2006). In other words, a plant with a projected construction cost of \$450 to 500 million would result in the equivalent of a property valuation in the range of \$157.5 to 200 million for the county.

Using the property tax rate of 1 percent, the estimated property tax revenue that would accrue to the County annually from such a plant would be approximately \$1.575 million to \$2.0 million.¹² This amount represents approximately 8 to 10 percent of the county’s total property tax revenue for the 2005-2006 fiscal year. This property tax revenue would then be distributed among local jurisdictions within the County based on the County Auditor’s formula that would be similar to, but not necessarily exactly the same as the allocation percentages that Colusa County uses to distribute revenues from property that it appraises itself (as shown on Table 8.8-8). Furthermore, Senate Bill 1317, signed into law on September 30, 2006, makes changes to how property taxes for new power plants constructed after January 1, 2007 will be allocated to local jurisdictions within a county. The total amount of assessed values allocated to any particular county would not be affected, but more of the revenue will be directed to the area where the actual construction occurs, by taking the share of revenue that would ordinarily flow to other cities within the county (in this case, the City of Colusa and the City of Williams) and directing those funds to the jurisdiction in which the construction actually occurs (in this case Colusa County, since the Maxwell area is unincorporated). The share of revenues that would flow to other special service districts within the County, such as fire districts or school districts, would not change (Swenson, 2006).

Given current legislation and tax revenue allocation practices, it is likely that Colusa County General Fund and local school districts would be the biggest beneficiaries of the increased property tax revenue, but many of the other special service districts and special purpose funds that provide a wide range of services to county residents would also benefit to a lesser extent. As stated in Section 8.8.2.3, this increased tax revenue could be used to contribute to the Colusa County General Plan goal of nurturing “the personal, academic, and professional growth of local residents” and to provide “social services that meet [residents’] needs at all stages in life” (CCGP, 1989).

¹² This is an estimated number and is subject to asset depreciation. Colusa County’s total property tax revenue for the 2005-2006 fiscal year was \$20,800,794.51 (Dawley, 2006).

Sales tax revenues accruing to Colusa County and Glenn County could increase slightly, due to increased retail sales in the area (i.e., gas, food, and lodging from construction and operation worker purchases and from the small amount of supplies purchased locally). However, the increased revenues would not likely constitute a substantial increase relative to revenues in Colusa County and the 10-county area.

8.8.3 Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations*, signed by President Clinton on February 11, 1994, requires federal government agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse effects of federal action on the health or environment of minority and low income populations. The U.S. EPA has published several guidelines for addressing environmental justice issues, including *Title VI Public Involvement Guidance* for EPA Assistance Recipients Administering Environmental Permitting Programs (Recipient Guidance) and *Guidance for Investigating Title VI Administrative Complaints Challenging Permits* (U.S. EPA, 2006a and 2006b).

Colusa and Glenn County residents were 36 and 29 percent minority, respectively, in 2000 (see Table 8.8-15). The range of percentage of minority residents by individual census tract in the two counties was approximately 18 to 47 percent in 2000.

In 1999, 16 and 18 percent of residents of Colusa and Glenn Counties, respectively, lived below the poverty level. The range of percentage of residents living below the poverty level by individual census tract in the two counties was approximately 13 to 22 percent, in 1999.

As shown in Figure 8.8-2, an area with a 6-mile radius centered on the project site includes parts of census tracts 103 and 105 in Glenn County, and census tract 4 in Colusa County.

Table 8.8-15 shows that census tract 105 in Glenn County was 39 percent minority in 2000. Approximately 2.5 square miles of census tract 105, which is approximately 400 square miles, are enclosed within the 6-mile radius boundary. The 2.5-square-mile area appeared to include fewer than three residences, and therefore is not likely to be inhabited by many people. Furthermore, the 2000 Census splits census tract 105 into two tracts, census tracts 105.01 and 105.02. The 6-mile radius would include a small portion of census tract 105.02, which was approximately 15 percent minority in 2000 according to the 2000 Census, not including white Hispanics in the minority count. Table 8.8-15 also shows that the census tracts within the 6-mile radius were comprised of 15 to 18 percent low income population (persons living below poverty level) in 1999. No concentrations of potential environmental justice populations were found within 6 miles of the site.

The migrant worker population could represent a temporary, concentrated low income population located near the project site. During summer months, the need for migrant worker housing could increase, and this population could represent a temporary concentrated population of low income persons.

The Cortina Rancheria is located approximately 25 miles south of the project site, within census tract 3 in Colusa County. This one-square-mile Rancheria is populated by less than 10 Native American people of all ages, in approximately six single-family homes. A total of 190 people are members of the Cortina Rancheria. The concentration of minority residents in the Rancheria is not easily discernible from census tract 3 data, because census tract 3 comprises approximately one-third of the county area (Wright, 2006).

In recent environmental justice analyses, the CEC has used consistent methodology under U.S. EPA guidelines. Under current U.S. EPA methodology and CEC practice, for potential environmental justice impacts to exist, an environmental justice population must be present within 6 miles of the project site and the project must result in "high and adverse" impacts that affect the environmental justice populations

disproportionately. As stated above, no minority or low-income populations that would represent environmental justice populations exist within 6 miles of the project site. Therefore, no environmental justice impacts attributable to the proposed project would result.

According to the Colusa County Office of Environmental Health (Kostlivi, 2006), and the Glenn County Office of Environmental Health (Backus, 2006), no health studies have been performed for specific populations within Colusa or Glenn counties.

Pollution sources within a 6-mile radius of the project site include the PG&E Compressor Station, the proposed project (during operation), an agricultural chemical dealership located west of I-5 at Lenahan Road, and two rice dryers located at the northeast corner of Delevan Road and I-5 (CARB, 2004) (see Figure 8.8-2). The agricultural chemical dealership emits pollution from transport of liquid ammonia for fertilizer. The rice dryers operate using natural gas, and emit particulate matter and NO_x.

The Toxic Chemical Release Inventory System (TRIS), EnviroStor Database and Hazardous Waste Tracking System (HWTS) showed no mapped hazardous waste sites within 6 miles of the project site (TRIS, 2004; EnviroStor, 2006; HWTS, 2006). Based on the location information on from these databases, no hazardous waste sites appear to be located within 6 miles of the CGS site.

8.8.4 Cumulative Impacts

Potential development proposals have been brought to the attention of the Colusa County Planning Department, but no formal applications have been submitted at this time. These proposals consist of the potential development of an 18-unit subdivision near Maxwell, located about 5 miles southeast of the project site. No further information is available on these potential projects, nor is there any available information on their schedules or likelihood of an Applicant submitting an application. The Colusa County Planning Department is not aware of any planned development projects in closer proximity to the project site. While increased demand for lodging services could occur in the area during construction of any future development projects, a sufficient number of rooms exist within commuting distance to accommodate the proposed project and the 18-unit subdivision.

Thus, based on the information that no development applications have been submitted in conjunction with the distance of possible future planned development and availability of lodging in the area, potential cumulative impacts to socioeconomics would be less than significant.

8.8.5 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts were identified. Therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary.

8.8.6 Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards

No specific federal statutes, ordinances, or regulations apply to socioeconomic impacts. California State Planning Law (Government Code Sections 65302 et seq.) requires that each city and county adopt a General Plan, consisting of seven mandatory elements, to guide planning and development within the jurisdiction. Most jurisdictions do not have laws, ordinances, or regulations specifically addressing the socioeconomic aspects of a project.

As stated in Section 8.8.3, Executive Order 12898 *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations* (1994) requires federal government agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse effects of federal action on the health or environment of minority and low income populations. U.S. EPA has adopted the Order, and California Environmental Protection Agency has established a working group for environmental justice concerns. The CEC

receives federal funding and therefore must address environmental justice concerns associated with projects under its permitting jurisdiction. Environmental justice concerns related to the proposed project are addressed in Section 8.8.3.

8.8.7 Involved Agencies and Agency Contacts

Various public service agencies were contacted in the course of the socioeconomics investigation to check on levels of activity and expected impacts of the proposed project.

Issue	Agency/Address	Contact/Title	Telephone
Economics	Colusa County Economic Development Council 1041 Main Street P.O. Box 1077 Colusa, CA 95932	Peter Jurusky, Executive Director	(530) 458-3028
Fiscal	Colusa County Tax Assessor's Office 546 Jay Street Colusa, CA 95932	Janet Dawley, Property Tax Manager	(530) 458-0400
Fire Protection Services	Maxwell Rural Fire District 231 Oak Street Maxwell, CA 95955	Jason Bowen, Firefighter	(530) 438-2320
Law Enforcement	Colusa County Sheriff's Department 929 Bridge Street Colusa, CA 95932	Nancy Dickson, Deputy	(530) 458-0200

8.8.8 Permits Required And Permit Schedule

There are no permits to protect socioeconomic values, as such. See Sections 8.4, Land Use; 8.6, Public Health; and 8.7, Worker Safety and Health, for permits relating to land use and public health and safety issues.

8.8.9 References

AIRS/AFS (Aerometric Information Retrieval System/Facility Subsystem database), 2006. AIRS/AFS data is derived from source reports by a range of stationary sources of air pollution and presents information regarding the air pollutants they generate. AIRS/AFS is utilized to produce State Implementation Plans, to track the compliance with regulatory programs, and to report air emissions approximations for pollutants which are regulated by the Clean Air Act. Released September 15, 2006.

BEA (Bureau of Economic Analysis), 2006. Website. <http://www.bea.gov/bea/regional/reis/default.cfm?catable=CA1-3>. July 26, 2006.

Backus, Kevin, 2006. Telephone communication between Kevin Backus, Glenn County Department of Environmental Health, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 17, 2006.

Balgenorth, Robert, State Building Trades Council, 2001. Personal communication with John Grattan, Grattan & Galati, and Brian Walker, Reliant Energy. July 2001.

- Bowen, Jason, 2006. Telephone communication between Jason Bowen, Maxwell Rural Station, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 1, 2006.
- CACP (Census of Agriculture County Profile 2002), 2006. Colusa, California. September 5, 2006.
- CARB (California Air Resources Board), 2006. Emissions Data Facility Search, released 2004. Website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/app/emsinv/facinfo/facinfo.php>. September 12, 2006.
- Carr, Dorthy, 2006. Telephone conversation between Dorthy Carr, Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 17, 2006.
- Cassi, Walt, 2006. Telephone conversation between Walt Cassi, Sutter County Department of Public Works, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 15, 2006.
- CCCC (Colusa County Chamber of Commerce), 2006a. Agriculture. Website. (<http://www.colusanet.com/colusachamber/City/Demog/Ag.htm>). July 25, 2006.
- CCCC (Colusa County Chamber of Commerce), 2006b. Labor Market. Website (<http://www.colusanet.com/colusachamber/City/Demog/Labor.htm>). July 26, 2006.
- CCCC (Colusa County Chamber of Commerce), 2006c. Community. Website. (<http://www.colusanet.com/colusachamber/City/Demog/Cmnty.htm>). August 8, 2006.
- CCCC (Colusa County Chamber of Commerce), 2006d. Utilities. Website. (<http://www.colusanet.com/colusachamber/City/Demog/Utility.htm>). August 8, 2006.
- CCDA (Colusa County Department of Agriculture), 2006. *Annual Crop Report 2005*. Harry A. Krug, Agricultural Commissioner.
- CCDHHS (Colusa County Department of Health and Human Services), 2006. Website. (<http://www.colusadhhs.org/index.html>). August 8, 2006.
- CCGP (Colusa County General Plan), 1989. Colusa County.
- Chatell, Joan, 2006. Telephone conversation between Joan Chatell, Colusa Community Hospital, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 1, 2006.
- Christiansen, Kristen, 2006. Telephone conversation between Kristen Christiansen El Dorado County Visitors Authority, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 17, 2006.
- CICG (California Institute for County Government). 2006a. Colusa County. Website. http://www.cicg.org/publications/profiles/colusa_county.pdf. July 28, 2006.
- CICG (California Institute for County Government). 2006b. Glenn County. Website. http://www.cicg.org/publications/profiles/glenn_county.pdf. July 28, 2006.
- Colusa County, 2006. Colusa County Allocation of 2006-2007 Property Taxes.
- Conley, Nancy, 2006. Sacramento Building and Construction Trades Council, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation, August 14, 2006.
- Dawley, Janet, 2006. Telephone conversation between Janet Dawley, Colusa County Tax Assessor's Office, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 23, 2006 and October 10, 2006.

- Devincenzi, Nadine, 2006. Telephone conversation between Nadine Devincenzi, Sacramento Convention and Visitors Bureau, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 17, 2006.
- Dickson, Nancy, 2006. Telephone conversation between Nancy Dickson, Colusa County Sheriff's Office, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 1, 2006.
- DOE (California Department of Education), 2006. Data Quest web page <http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>. August 1, 2006.
- DOF (California Department of Finance), 2006a. Race/Ethnic Population Projections for 2000-2050 and County Population Estimates. Website. <http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/ReportsPapers/ReportsPapers.asp#census> . August 27, 2006.
- DOF (California Department of Finance), 2006b. County Profiles. Website. http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/FS_DATA/profiles/pf_home.asp. August 8, 2006.
- DOF (California Department of Finance), 2006c. County Rankings by Population Size. Colusa County Profile. Website. http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/FS_DATA/profiles/colusa.xls. July 27, 2006.
- DOF (California Department of Finance), 2006d. County Rankings by Population Size. Glenn County Profile. Website. http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/FS_DATA/profiles/glenn.xls. July 27, 2006.
- DOF (California Department of Finance), 2006e. Population and Housing Estimate. Website. <http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/ReportsPapers/Estimates/E5/E5-06/E-5text2.asp>. August 14, 2006.
- DOF (California Department of Finance), 2006f. City/County Population Estimates. Website. <http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/ReportsPapers/Estimates/E1/E-1text.asp>. August 17, 2006.
- DOF (California Department of Finance), 2006g. County Rankings by Population Size. Shasta County Profile. Website. http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/FS_DATA/profiles/shasta.xls. August 27, 2006.
- DOF (California Department of Finance), 2006h. E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2006, with 2000 Benchmark. Website. <http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/ReportsPapers/Estimates/E4/E4-01-06/HistE-4.asp>. October 16, 2006.
- Drake-Martinez, Cindy, 2006. Telephone conversation between Cindy Drake-Martinez, Yolo County Visitors Bureau, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 17, 2006.
- EDD (California Economic Development Department), 2006a. Historical Employment by Industry for Colusa County. Website: <http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indhist/colushaw.xls>. July 26, 2006.
- EDD (California Economic Development Department), 2006b. Historical Employment by Industry for Glenn County. Website: <http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indhist/glennhaw.xls>. July 26, 2006.
- EDD (California Economic Development Department), 2006c. Industry Employment and Labor Force for California. Website: <http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indhist/calshaw.xls>. July 26, 2006.
- EDD (California Economic Development Department), 2006d. Historical Employment for Colusa County. Website: <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/cgi/databrowsing/localAreaProfileQS>

- MoreResult.asp?menuChoice=localAreaPro&criteria=Unemployment+Rate&categoryType=employment&geogArea=0604000011&area=Colusa+County×eries=Unemployment+RateTimeseries. July 26, 2006.
- EDD (California Economic Development Department), 2006e. Industry Employment Projections for Colusa County. Website: <http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indproj/colustb2.htm>. July 26, 2006.
- EDD (California Economic Development Department), 2006f. Industry Employment Projections for Glenn County. Website: <http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indproj/glenntb2.htm>. July 26, 2006.
- EDD (California Economic Development Department), 2006g. Industry Employment for Yuba City Metropolitan Statistical Area. Website: [http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indhist/yuba\\$haw.xls](http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indhist/yuba$haw.xls). July 27, 2006.
- EDD (California Economic Development Department), 2006h. Industry Employment for Sacramento Metropolitan Statistical Area. Website: [http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indhist/sacr\\$haw.xls](http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indhist/sacr$haw.xls). July 27, 2006.
- EDD (California Economic Development Department), 2006i. Industry Employment Projections Sutter and Yuba Counties. Website: <http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indproj/sutyutb2.htm>. July 27, 2006.
- EDD (California Economic Development Department), 2006j. Projections of Employment by Industry and Occupation. Website: <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/cgi/databrowsing/?PageID=145>. July 27, 2006.
- EDD (California Economic Development Department), 2006k. Labor Force Information for Butte County. Website: <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/cgi/dataanalysis/labForceReport.asp?menuchoice=LABFORCE>. July 27, 2006.
- EDD (California Economic Development Department), 2006l. Labor Force Information for Shasta County. Website: <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/cgi/databrowsing/localAreaProSelection.asp?menuChoice=localAreaPro&selectedIndex=0>. August 27, 2006.
- EnviroStor Database. 2006. The Department of Toxic Substances Control's (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program's (SMBRP) EnviroStor database recognizes sites that have known contamination or sites for which there may be reasons to investigate further. The database contains these site types: Federal Superfund sites (National Priorities List (NPL)); State Response, including Military Facilities and State Superfund; Voluntary Cleanup; and School sites. Released October 9, 2006.
- Etchepare, Jeanmarie, 2001. Telephone communication between Jeanmarie Etchepare, Emerald Farms, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. March 8, 2001.
- Executive Order 12898 Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations, signed by President Clinton on February 11, 1994.
- Favila, Jaime, 2001. Telephone communication between Jaime Favila, Colusa County Department of Environmental Health, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. May 3 and 16, 2001.
- Garcia, Anahi, 2006. Telephone communication between Anahi Garcia, Colusa County Tax Collector, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 18, 2006.

- Goeller, Vivien, 2006. Telephone communication between Vivien Goeller, Chico Chamber of Commerce, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 15, 2006.
- Greg, Kathy, 2006. Telephone communication between Kathy Greg, Yuba County Department of Public Works, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 15, 2006.
- Holiday Inn Express. 2006. Telephone communication between Perla, Holiday Inn Express Williams, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation, August 1, 2006.
- HWTS (Hazardous Waste Tracking System). 2006. Department of Toxic Substances Control Hazardous Waste Facility Search. October 9, 2006.
- Johanns, Kent, 2006. Telephone communication between Kent Johanns, Colusa County Planning Department, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 14, 2006.
- Jukusky, Peter, 2006. Telephone communication between Peter Jukusky, Colusa County Economic Development Council, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 1, 2006.
- Kostlivy, Rob, 2006. Telephone communication between Rob Livy, Colusa County Office of Environmental Health, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 18, 2006.
- Krznarich, Ron, 2006. Telephone communication between Ron Krznarich, Shasta Lake Fire Protection District, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 27, 2006.
- Martinez, Lela, 2006. Telephone communication between, Lela Martinez, Colusa County Chamber of Commerce, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation, July 27, 2006.
- Metcalf, Melody, 2006. Telephone communication between Melody Metcalf, Holiday Inn Express Yuba City, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 22, 2006.
- MMC (Mercy Medical Center), 2006. Website. http://redding.mercy.org/stellent/websites/get_page_cache.asp?nodeId=5000943 August 27, 2006.
- Norton, Jonelle, 2006. Telephone communication between Jonelle Norton, Placer Valley Tourism, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 17, 2006.
- Randlesa, Anne, 2006. Telephone communication between Anne Randlesa, Maxwell Unified School District, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 18, 2006.
- Roadside (Roadside America), 2006. Website. <http://www.roadsideamerica.com/hotels-motels/state/us-ca.html>. August 1, 2006.
- SCVB (Sacramento Convention and Visitors Bureau), 2006. Sacramento Convention and Visitors Bureau website, <http://www.discovergold.org/visitor/accommodations2.cfm?id=18>. August 14, 2006.
- Scrogginf, Peggy, 2006. Telephone communication between Peggy Scrogginf, Colusa County Auditor's Office, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation, August 11, 2006.
- Smith, Shirley. 2001. Telephone communication between Shirley Smith, Duke/Fluor Daniel, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation, April 10 and July 31, 2001.

- Steelman, A.C. 2006. Telephone communication between A.C. Steelman, Mid Valley Building and Construction Trades Council, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation, August 16, 2006.
- Swenson, Jennifer. 2006. Telephone communication between Jennifer Swenson, Legislative Director, Office of Senator Torlakson, and Mara Feeney, Mara Feeney & Associates, October 18 and 19, 2006.
- Thompson, Ken. 2006. Telephone communication between Ken Thompson Principal Property Appraiser, California State Board of Equalization and Mara Feeney, Mara Feeney & Associates, October 18, 2006.
- TRIS (Toxic Chemical Release Inventory System). 2004. Environmental Protection Agency. TRIS identifies facilities that release toxic chemicals to the land, air and water in reportable quantities under SARA Title III Section 313. Released 2004.
- USCB (U.S. Census Bureau). 2006a. Annual Estimates of Population. Website. <http://www.census.gov/popest/cities/tables/SUB-EST2004-04-06.xls>. July 28, 2006.
- USCB (U.S. Census Bureau). 2006b. Fact Sheet, Colusa County. Website http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/SAFFFacts?_event=Search&_lang=en&_sse=on&geo_id=05000US06011&_county=Colusa%20County&show_2003_tab=&redirect=Y. July 28, 2006.
- USCB (U.S. Census Bureau). 2006c. Fact Sheet, Glenn County. Website http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/SAFFFacts?_event=Search&_lang=en&_sse=on&geo_id=05000US06021&_county=Glenn%20County&show_2003_tab=&redirect=Y. July 28, 2006.
- USCB (U.S. Census Bureau). 2006d. Census 2000 Summary File 4. Website http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DatasetMainPageServlet?_program=DEC&_submenuId=datasets_1&_lang=en&_ts=. August 14, 2006.
- USCB (U.S. Census Bureau). 2006e. State and County Quick Facts. <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/index.html>. September 12, 2006.
- USCB (U.S. Census Bureau). 2006f. 2004 County Business Patterns. <http://censtats.census.gov/cgi-bin/cbpnaic/cbpsel.pl>. October 16, 2006.
- USDA (U.S. Department of Agriculture), 2006. *2002 Census of Agriculture Colusa County Profile*. National Agriculture Statistics Service.
- U.S. EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), 2006a. *Title VI Public Involvement Guidance for EPA Assistance Recipients Administering Environmental Permitting Programs (Recipient Guidance)*.
- U.S. EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), 2006b. *Guidance for Investigating Title VI Administrative Complaints Challenging Permits*.
- VISTA. 2001. Vista Information Systems, Inc. Site Assessment Report. May 22, 2001.
- Wilson, Danielle. 2006. Telephone communication between Danielle Wilson, Maxwell Unified School District, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 3, 2006.

Wright, Avis. 2006. Telephone communication between Avis Wright, Cortina Rancheria, and Tammy Dorje, URS Corporation. August 18, 2006.

Yuba-Sutter. 2006. Visit Yuba-Sutter. Website. (http://www.visityubasutter.com/lodging/outlying_areas.htm). August 8, 2006.

Table 8.8-1 Ten Leading Commodities in Colusa County, 2005			
Commodity	Acreage*	Tons*	Value (\$ million)
Rice	136,400	497,860	\$125.0
Almonds ~ Meats	26,400	22,176	\$122.0
Tomatoes ~ Processing	23,650	839,575	\$42.8
Cattle and Calves	26,200 Heads	146,000 Cwt.	\$13.3
Walnuts ~ English	4,640	8,352	\$11.7
Rice ~ Seed	7,110	25,951	\$7.8
Onion ~ Seed	710	179	\$6.8
Hay ~ Alfalfa	6,100	43,920	\$5.1
Cucumber ~ Seed	4,230	340	\$4.7
Beans ~ Dry	6,050	5,324	\$3.8
Source: CCDA, 2006.			
*Unless otherwise denoted.			

Table 8.8-2 Labor Force, Employment and Industry Colusa County and Glenn County			
Measure	1995	2000	2005
Civilian Labor Force	20,040	20,600	21,720
Civilian Employment	16,560	18,580	19,490
Civilian Unemployment Rate	17.4%	9.8%	10.3%
Percent of Employment, By Industry			
Farming	28%	27%	25%
Natural Resources, Mining and Construction	2%	3%	3%
Manufacturing	11%	12%	9%
Trade, Transportation and Utilities	18%	15%	17%
Financial Activities	2%	2%	2%
Professional and Business Services	1%	1%	1%
Educational and Health Services	4%	4%	5%
Leisure and Hospitality	8%	7%	8%
Other Services	3%	2%	2%
Government	23%	27%	28%
Source: EDD, 2006a and 2006b			

Table 8.8-3 Labor Force, Employment and Industry, Yuba Metropolitan Statistical Area			
Employment and Labor Force	1995	2000	2005
Civilian Labor Force	55,200	62,200	67,000
Civilian Employment	46,200	56,700	60,800
Civilian Unemployment Rate	16.3%	8.8%	9.2%
Percent of Employment, By Industry			
Farming	16.5%	14.2%	11.2%
Natural Resources, Mining and Construction	5.5%	5.3%	5.8%
Manufacturing	6.8%	7.9%	5.8%
Trade, Transportation and Utilities	18.1%	16.9%	17.9%
Financial Activities	3.9%	3.2%	3.4%
Professional and Business Services	5.2%	6.5%	7.2%
Educational and Health Services	9.4%	9.7%	11.6%
Leisure and Hospitality	7.6%	7.4%	7.8%
Other Services	2.6%	2.6%	2.7%
Government	23.3%	25.3%	25.5%
Source: EDD, 2006g.			
Note:			
^a The Yuba Metropolitan Statistical Area includes Yuba and Sutter counties.			

Table 8.8-4 Labor Force, Employment and Industry, Sacramento Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area			
Measure	1995	2000	2005
Civilian Labor Force	7958,800	904,500	1,020,000
Civilian Employment	742,200	865,700	971,900
Civilian Unemployment Rate	6.7%	4.3%	4.7%
Percent of Employment, By Industry			
Farming	1.3%	1.1%	0.8%
Natural Resources, Mining and Construction	4.7%	6.7%	8.4%
Manufacturing	6.6%	6.4%	5.5%
Trade, Transportation and Utilities	17.2%	17.1%	16.8%
Financial Activities	6.0%	6.5%	7.1%
Professional and Business Services	11.2%	13.1%	11.6%
Educational and Health Services	9.4%	8.7%	9.9%
Leisure and Hospitality	9.3%	8.7%	9.3%
Other Services	3.2%	3.3%	3.2%
Government	28.5%	26.1%	25.3%
Source: EDD, 2006h.			

Table 8.8-5 Population Trends and Projections				
Year	Colusa– Glenn	YMSA	SCMSA	State
1980	34,400	102,400	1,106,700	23.8 million
AARG, 1980-1990	2%	2%	3.5%	2.5%
1990	41,150	123,400	1,490,900	29.8 million
AARG, 1990-2000	1.1%	1.2%	2.1%	1.4%
2000	45,641	140,017	1,808,388	34.0 million
AARG, 2000-2010	1.4%	2%	2.8%	1.5%
2010	52,045	167,263	2,315,709	39.2 million
AARG, 2010-2020	1.2%	1.8%	2.5%	1.2%
2020	58,287	196,672	2,895,048	43.9 million
AARG, 2020-2030	0.9%	1.5%	1.8%	1%
2030	63,732	225,175	3,408,325	48.1 million
Source: DOF, 2006a.				
AARG = Average Annual Rate of Growth				
Colusa–Glenn = Colusa County and Glenn County				
SCMSA = Sacramento Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area				
YMSA = Yuba Metropolitan Statistical Area				

Table 8.8-6 Housing, 2006					
Location	Total Units	Single-Family	Multi-Family	Mobile Homes	Vacancy Rate (%)
Colusa	7,587	5,883	875	829	9.8
Glenn	10,522	7,513	1,480	1,529	8.1
Colusa-Glenn	18,109	13,396	2,355	2,358	8.9
Sutter	32,472	24,889	5,863	1,710	4.5
Yuba	26,631	18,928	3,859	3,844	10
YMSA	59,103	43,829	9,722	5,554	7.2
El Dorado	81,478	67,699	9,404	4,375	16.9
Placer	140,330	113,098	22,494	4,738	10.9
Sacramento	535,788	377,741	142,338	15,709	4.3
Yolo	70,542	45,538	21,319	3,658	3.5
SCMSA	828,138	604,076	195,555	28,480	8.9
Source: DOF, 2006e. SCMSA = Sacramento Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area YMSA = Yuba Metropolitan Statistical Area					

Table 8.8-7 Maxwell Unified School District Enrollment					
School	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	Annual Average Percent Change^a
Maxwell Elementary (K-8)	309	307	319	303	-1.9
Maxwell High (9-12)	139	134	126	130	-6.5
Enid Prine High (9-12)	7	6	10	9	28.6
Total – Maxwell Unified S.D.	455	447	455	442	0.9
Percent of County Enrollment	10.3	10.2	10.2	9.8	-2.9
Percent of State Enrollment	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	-
Source: DOE, 2006. Note: ^a Annual Average percent change from 2002-2003 to 2005-2006 school year.					

Table 8.8-8 Colusa County Allocation of Property Taxes, Fiscal Year 2006-2007			
Fund	% of Total	Fund	% of Total
General Fund	31.27		
Bridge Fund	0.51	Walnut Ranch Lighting No. 1	0.02
Total Local Agencies Countywide	31.78	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation	2.35
City of Colusa	4.59	Princeton/Codora/Glenn Irr.	0.40
City of Williams	4.92	Provident Irrigation	0
Cities	9.51	Colusa Mosquito Abatement	0.87
County Road District	3.03	Reclamation District No. 2047	0.13
Total Road District	3.03	Arbuckle PUD General	0.29
Arbuckle-College City	1.39	Maxwell PUD General	0.39
Bear Valley – Indian Valley	0.16	Princeton Waterworks	0.02
Glenn-Colusa	0.02	Cortina Creek Flood Control	0.05
Maxwell	0.31	Total Other Special Districts	4.52
Princeton	0.18	Princeton	1.28
Williams	0.34	Stonyford	0.26
Sacramento River	0.40	Colusa	11.01
Total Fire Districts	2.80	Maxwell	2.91
Arbuckle	0.27	Pierce Joint	8.63
College City	0.13	Williams	9.24
Colusa	0.50	Total Unified Schools	33.3
Cypress Hill	0.01	Yuba Jr. Community College	12.11
Grand Island	0.07	Total Community Colleges	12.11
Maxwell	0.10	School Service- Glenn Co.	0.33
Princeton	0.04	School Service – Colusa Co.	1.15
Stonyford	0.02	Total Superintendent of Schools	1.48
Williams	0.30	ERAF – Schools	0
Total Cemetery Districts	1.44	ERAF – Community College	0
TOTAL 100%		Total ERAF	0
Source: Colusa County, 2006.			
Note:			
ERAF = Education Revenue Augmentation Fund			

**Table 8.8-9
Construction Employment**

Month	Boiler-makers	Carpenters	Electricians	Iron-workers	Laborers	Pipe-fitters	Painters/Insulation Workers	Brick-layers/Masons	Mill-wrights	Operating Engineers	Total Craft	Contractor Staff	Total Site Staff
1		3	1		9	1				8	22	14	36
2		4	1	4	12	1		3		11	36	18	54
3		12	2	13	19	2		9		16	73	23	96
4		20	2	14	26	2		21		21	106	26	132
5		27	3	24	29	3		24		24	134	27	161
6	9	38	10	41	39	4		28		29	198	32	230
7	17	50	11	44	43	5		36		30	236	38	274
8	29	63	11	29	44	42		33		31	282	43	325
9	39	68	16	14	44	64		21	13	31	310	43	353
10	50	68	14	12	48	91		10	26	35	354	43	397
11	57	67	58	10	54	120	6	9	43	45	469	44	513
12	59	66	78	9	61	148	6	9	59	50	545	44	589
13	62	60	98	8	68	162	10	7	76	55	607	48	655
14	50	36	146	3	67	157	12	5	85	55	621	48	669
15	40	35	150	1	65	147	14	4	97	52	605	46	651
16	22	30	165	1	64	116	14	3	97	51	563	46	609
17	20	25	154		59	54	10	1	79	40	442	45	487
18	13	16	130		45	24	8		46	27	309	45	354
19	4	11	62		32	12	6		26	19	172	32	204
20		7	55		17	9	6		20	8	122	30	152
21	4	5	33	3	11	24			12	6	98	9	107
22	2	3	10	2	10	10			6	4	47	3	50
23	2	3	7	2	9	5			1	4	33	2	35
24	2	3	6	2	9	4			1	3	30	2	32


 = peak period

Table 8.8-10 Maximum Number of Workers, by Craft		
Trade	Maximum	Month(s) of Maximum Employment
Boilermakers	62	13
Carpenters	68	9,10
Electricians	165	16
Ironworkers	44	7
Laborers	68	13
Pipefitters	162	13
Painters/Insulation Workers	14	15, 16
Bricklayers/Masons	36	7
Millwrights	97	15, 16
Operating Engineers	55	13, 14
Note:		
^a See Table 8.8-9 for correlation of numbers to month.		

Table 8.8-11 Permanent Employment Colusa Generating Station	
Type	Number
Power Plant Technicians	13
Lead Power Plant Technicians	4
Operations Supervisor	1
Engineer	1
EH&S Coordinator	1
Chemist	1
Plant Manager	1
Procurement Specialist	1
Administrative Supervisor	1
Administrative Assistant	1
Maintenance Supervisor	1
Maintenance Safety Engineer	1
ITC Technicians	2
Electrician	1
Mechanic	1
Total	31

Table 8.8-12 Pipeline Construction Staff by Trade		
Month After Pipeline Construction Start	1	2
Laborers	4	4
Welders	2	2
Equipment Operators	2	2
Supervision	1	1
Inspectors	1	1
Total	10	10





Table 8.8-13 Temporary Housing Availability Near the Proposed Project		
Area^a	Hotel Rooms and Recreational Vehicle Spaces	Cumulative Number of Hotel Rooms and Recreational Vehicle Spaces
Colusa County (cities of Williams and Colusa)	413	413
Glenn County (cities of Willows and Orland)	199	612
YMSA	529	1,141
Chico, Corning, Oroville, Clearlake and Davis	1,192	2,333
Sacramento SCMSA	15,673	18,006
Sources: Telephone research, August 2006: Jukusky, 2006; Holiday Inn, 2006; Roadside, 2006; Yuba-Sutter, 2006; Drake-Martinez, 2006; Norton, 2006; Christiansen, 2006; Devincenzi, 2006.		
Notes:		
^a In order of increasing distance from the project site.		

Table 8.8-14 Gravity Model — Operation Employees						
City	2006 Population	County	Distance From Site	Factor^a	Weight^b	Number of Employees
Within 40 Miles						
Willows	6,456	Glenn	18	359	2.4%	3
Williams	4,816	Colusa	19	253	1.7%	2
Colusa	5,608	Colusa	23	244	1.6%	2
Orland	6,692	Glenn	27	248	1.6%	2
Chico	73,918	Butte	38	1,945	12.8%	15
Corning	7,110	Tehama	39	182	1.2%	1
Beyond 40 Miles						
Yuba City	58,516	Sutter	47	1,245	8.2%	1
Oroville	13,432	Butte	47	286	1.9%	0
Marysville	12,750	Yuba	49	260	1.7%	0
Clearlake	13,912	Lake	57	244	1.6%	0
Woodland	53,345	Yolo	59	904	6.0%	1
Sacramento	452,050	Sacramento	60	7,534	50.0%	4
Davis	64,338	Yolo	68	946	6.2%	0
W. Sacramento	40,164	Yolo	75	536	3.5%	0
Sources: DOF, 2006f.						
Notes:						
Numbers may not add exactly, due to rounding.						
^a Factor equals population divided by distance from the project site.						
^b Weight is factor divided by the sum of the factors.						

Table 8.8-15 Race and Poverty Data					
Area	Population	Minority Population	Percentage Minority	Population Living Below Poverty Level^a	Percentage Living Below Poverty Level^a
Colusa County Census Tracts					
1	4,433	1,838	41.5%	552	12.5%
2	4,534	1,534	33.8%	712	16.1%
3	4,581	2,139	46.7%	789	17.5%
4	2,607	528	20.3%	451	18.3%
5	2,649	714	27.0%	460	17.4%
Glenn County Census Tracts					
101	7,341	2,252	30.7%	1,343	18.4%
102	4,205	773	18.4%	653	15.5%
103	2,234	422	18.9%	358	17.0%
104	7,632	2,255	29.5%	1,610	21.7%
105	5,041	1,963	38.9%	765	15.3%
Larger Areas					
Colusa County	18,804	6,753	35.9%	2,964	15.8%
Glenn County	26,453	7,665	29.0%	4,729	18.1%
Source: USCB, 2006d					
Notes:					
^a Based on 1999 Income and Population Census Data					



LEGEND

-  Sacramento Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area
-  Yuba Metropolitan Statistical Area
-  Colusa-Glenn
-  Butte and Tehama Counties

SOCIOECONOMIC FOCUS AREA

28067004
November 2006

Colusa Generating Station
E&L Westcoast, LLC
Colusa County, California



FIGURE 8.8-1

