

**SECTION 5.8 SOCIOECONOMICS
CONTENTS**

| | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| 5.8 | SOCIOECONOMICS | 5.8-1 |
| 5.8.1 | Affected Environment | 5.8-1 |
| 5.8.1.1 | Existing and Projected Employment | 5.8-1 |
| 5.8.1.2 | Demographics and Community Trends | 5.8-2 |
| 5.8.1.3 | Housing..... | 5.8-2 |
| 5.8.1.4 | Public Services and Facilities | 5.8-2 |
| 5.8.2 | Environmental Impacts..... | 5.8-4 |
| 5.8.2.1 | Construction-Related Impacts | 5.8-5 |
| 5.8.2.2 | Operational Impacts..... | 5.8-7 |
| 5.8.3 | Environmental Justice Screening Analysis..... | 5.8-12 |
| 5.8.4 | Mitigation Measures | 5.8-14 |
| 5.8.5 | Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts | 5.8-14 |
| 5.8.6 | Cumulative Impacts..... | 5.8-14 |
| 5.8.7 | Applicable Laws, Ordinances, Regulations and Standards (LORS) | 5.8-14 |
| 5.8.7.1 | State and Local Authorities and Administering Agencies..... | 5.8-15 |
| 5.8.7.2 | TPP Compliance With Socioeconomic LORS | 5.8-15 |
| 5.8.8 | Involved Agencies and Agency Contacts | 5.8-15 |
| 5.8.9 | Permits Required and Permit Schedule | 5.8-16 |
| 5.8.10 | References | 5.8-16 |

List of Tables

| | | |
|--------------|--|--------|
| Table 5.8-1 | Employment Data by County, 1999 | 5.8-2 |
| Table 5.8-2. | Estimated Availability of Skilled Workers by Trade | 5.8-6 |
| Table 5.8-3. | Alameda County Budget Appropriations for FY 1999, FY 2000, and FY 2001 (in Millions of Dollars) | 5.8-10 |
| Table 5.8-4. | Alameda County Revenues, 1999 to 2001 (\$ Million) | 5.8-11 |
| Table 5.8-5. | Distribution of Annual Property Taxes Paid by the Project..... | 5.8-11 |
| Table 5.8-6. | Distribution of Annual Sales Taxes Paid by the Project | 5.8-12 |
| Table 5.8-7. | Demographic Information for Census Tracts Near the Project Site..... | 5.8-13 |
| Table 5.8-8. | Involved Agencies and Agency Contacts..... | 5.8-15 |

List of Figures

| | | |
|---------------|--|-----------|
| Figure 5.8-1. | Minority Populations Within 6 Miles of the TPP Site..... | In Pocket |
|---------------|--|-----------|

5.8 SOCIOECONOMICS

This section discusses the socioeconomic effects of the proposed project on regional and community resources. The regional area includes Alameda County and San Joaquin County, and includes two Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), the Oakland MSA (the Oakland MSA includes all of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties), and the Stockton MSA. The immediate project area includes unincorporated portions of eastern Alameda County. Population data and growth trends, the economic base of the region, workforce requirements and availability, housing, and public services are considered in this section.

5.8.1 Affected Environment

The proposed Tesla Power Project (TPP) site is located in the eastern most area of Alameda County approximately 1.2 miles south of the intersection of interstate 205 and 580, and approximately three-quarters of a mile west of the San Joaquin County line. The proposed TPP site is located in an unincorporated portion of Alameda County on land bordered to the north by Southern Pacific rail lines and to the east by Midway Road (see Figure 3.2-1). The project includes three linear components: a 2.8-mile long natural gas pipeline that extends from the project site east into San Joaquin County; a 1.7 mile water supply pipeline; and, a 0.8 mile transmission line from the project site to the PG&E Midway Substation. From an overall project perspective, these linear components are a minor part of the project and their socioeconomic effects are considered to be insignificant. See Section 3.0 for a detailed description of these facilities.

As shown on Figure 5.7-3 (Section 5.7, Land Use), the TPP site is currently used as pasture land. Pasture land occupies most of the land within the immediate vicinity of the site.

5.8.1.1 Existing and Projected Employment

Situated on the east side of the San Francisco Bay, Alameda County is part of California's busiest urban area. It is established as a major port for the Pacific Rim trade and its diverse economic base includes manufacturing, services, wholesale and retail businesses. Services is the largest industry in the county, accounting for 28.5 percent of the employment. Another significant industry sector providing employment is trade at 22.6 percent. Wholesale trade added the most jobs in 1998 [California Employment Development Department (EDD), 2001].

Table 5.8-1 provides information on the characteristics of the labor force of Alameda and San Joaquin counties for 1999 compared to California. Alameda County had unemployment rates well below California's unemployment rate of 5.2 percent. San Joaquin County, however, exceeds the state unemployment level with a rate of 8.7. EDD does not project unemployment rates but calculates prevailing unemployment rates.

Table 5.8-1 Employment Data by County, 1999

| Area | Labor Force | Employment | Unemployment | Unemployment Rate % |
|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|---------------------|
| Alameda County | 722,200 | 697,400 | 24,800 | 3.4 |
| San Joaquin County | 252,900 | 230,800 | 22,100 | 8.7 |
| California | 16,585,900 | 15,721,700 | 864,000 | 5.2 |

Source: EDD, 2000

5.8.1.2 Demographics and Community Trends

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the population of Alameda County grew from 1,279,182 to 1,443,741 between 1990 and 2000, which represents an annual average growth rate of more than 1.2 percent; the population of the Livermore-Pleasanton County subdivision grew from 135,835 to 171,652 between 1990 and 2000, which represents an annual average growth rate of more than 2.6 percent (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

The California Department of Finance (CDOF) reports that the most rapid growth in Alameda County is occurring in the cities of Dublin and Livermore and their surrounding unincorporated areas, in the central and eastern portions of the county respectively (CDOF, 2001).

Population forecasts by the CDOF indicate that the population of Alameda County is expected to reach 1,811,800 by the year 2020 (CDOF, 2001). According to these projections, the growth rate for Alameda County is estimated to continue at about 1.3 percent per year, resulting in an estimated 25 percent increase between 2000 and 2020.

San Joaquin County has a population of 579,700 and is expected to reach approximately 800,000 by 2020. San Joaquin County is expected to have a higher growth rate than most areas in California (CDOF, 2001).

San Joaquin County has approximately 190,000 dwelling units with a vacancy rate of 4.9%. Both counties have vacancy rates that could be considered in short supply.

5.8.1.3 Housing

In 2000, Alameda County had approximately 536,495 dwelling units. According to federal housing standards, the housing market in an area is considered to be in short supply when the overall vacancy rate is less than 5 percent. In 2000, the CDOF reported an Alameda County housing vacancy rate of 4.97 percent (CDOF, 2001).

5.8.1.4 Public Services and Facilities

A number of public services and facilities are provided to residents in the project area, including water and sewer services, police services, fire protection services, and school facilities.

Water

The Zone 7 Water District (Zone 7) supplies water in portions of eastern Alameda County. Water for the TTP will be provided by the Rosedale-Rio Bravo Water District and will be delivered to the site from the California Aqueduct under an agreement with Zone 7. The Rosedale-Rio Bravo Water District holds exportable ground and surface rights and is a member of the Kern County Water Authority.

Additional discussion of water supply is provided in Section 5.4, Water Resources.

Sewer

There is no sewer system serving the project area.

Police

Police services in Alameda County are provided by the Alameda County Sheriff's Department (ACSD). The department's closest responding station is located at 15001 Foothill Blvd. in the city of San Leandro. Currently, officers patrol the area on a 24 hour basis and the average response time to calls in the vicinity of the project site is estimated at 29 minutes (ACSD, 2001).

Fire and Emergency Services

The Alameda County Fire Department (ACFD) serves the project area. The closest station is Station 8, located at 1617 College Avenue in Livermore, approximately 16 miles from the project site. Station 8 is staffed on a 24 hour basis so, in the event of a structural fire, this unit of volunteer fire fighters responds to the call and is normally joined by other paid and volunteer units, dispatched from other parts of the community as needed. The response time to the project site is currently estimated at 16 to 18 minutes (ACFD, 2001).

Emergency medical services are provided by county sheriff and fire units and local ambulance services. There are a number of emergency hospitals in the Alameda area that can provide most types of routine and emergency medical treatment, including intensive care. The closest emergency medical facility to the project site is the Valley Care Hospital, located at 55 W. Las Positas Blvd. in the city of Pleasanton (ACFD, 2001).

Schools

The immediate project area is served by the following school districts:

- Mountain House Elementary School District; and
- Tracy Unified School District

The Mountain House Elementary School District includes the project vicinity and maintains one facility in the community of Byron. It is a kindergarten through 8th grade facility, located at 3950 Mt. House Road. During the 2000-2001 school year, attendance totaled 50 students. (Mountain House Elementary School District, 2001).

The Tracy Unified School District includes the project vicinity and maintains three high school campuses, three junior high school campuses, twelve elementary school campuses, and one adult education centers, in western San Joaquin County. Total enrollment in the district during the 2000-2001 school year is approximately 14,000 students. The closest high school facility to the project site is Merrill F. West High School, located at 1775 W. Lowell Avenue in Rio Linda. Enrollment at Merrill F. West High School during the 2000-2001 school year is approximately 2,200 students (Tracy Unified School District, 2001).

Recreation

The Livermore Area Recreational Park District (LARPD) maintains the 42 parks in and around the city of Livermore. This district is the closest to the project site in Alameda County. The City of Tracy Park and Recreation Department maintains 52 parks. This district is the closest to the project site in San Joaquin County. There are no state or locally maintained regional or city parks within a one-mile radius of the project site (LARPD, 2001; City of Tracy, 2001).

5.8.2 Environmental Impacts

The local environmental consequences of the TPP were determined by comparing the construction and operational workforce with the socioeconomic resources of the surrounding unincorporated communities and rural areas included in the Livermore-Pleasanton County subdivision. Regional consequences were determined by comparing the TPP workforce with the socioeconomic resources of Alameda County. Potential socioeconomic impacts can include effects on a community's population, economic base, employment, housing, and public services and facilities, including water supplies, waste water treatment facilities, fire and police services, and school facilities.

The criteria used in determining whether project-related socioeconomic impacts are significant are consistent with standard industry practice and California Code of Regulations Title 14, § 15065. Project related impacts are determined to be significant if they:

- Induce substantial growth or concentration of population, either directly or indirectly
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of housing elsewhere
- Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community

Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities.

5.8.2.1 Construction-Related Impacts

Construction-related impacts are short-term impacts that may be caused by people moving into the project area to participate in the construction of the proposed facility, and would include any associated increase in demand for public services and facilities.

Construction Impacts on Employment

Construction of the TPP is expected to begin in May 2002 and continue for a total of 23 months until April 2004. Construction would provide job opportunities for an average of 485 construction workers during construction of the project (see Figure 3.6-1). The maximum construction workforce of the TPP will be approximately 974 workers for approximately 2 months during the construction period.

The Alameda Building Trades Council (ABTC) coordinates labor union activities and oversees the allocation of appropriately skilled workers for construction projects in the Alameda area. Membership in the ABTC included approximately 35,000 skilled workers. The ABTC is currently providing approximately 2,000 workers for the construction of the Oakland Port/Airport Expansion Project for the City of Oakland. The ABTC is also providing 500 construction workers for the construction of the New Motors United Manufacturing Facility. Therefore, the ABTC expects to be able to provide a sufficient number of appropriately skilled construction workers during the scheduled 2002-2004 construction period (ABTC, 2001).

Payrolls of project construction employees will have a positive impact on the area. In estimating the economic impact of these construction jobs, an average annual salary, including benefits, of \$75,000 for each construction-related employee was assumed. Worker availability depends entirely on the number of projects being constructed during the time of TPP's construction so an exact determination of the availability of skilled labor is not possible. Table 5.8-2 illustrates the estimate of skilled workers by trade. See Table 3.7-2 for a detailed review of the skilled labor by craft needed throughout the construction of TPP. Since an average of 485 construction workers will be employed on this project for 23 months, it is estimated that the one-time construction payroll will be approximately \$70 million. This figure does not include the amount of increased trade expected at suppliers and construction-related businesses during this period.

Table 5.8-2. Estimated Availability of Skilled Workers by Trade

| | |
|-----------------------|---------|
| Iron Workers | 50-100 |
| Boiler Makers | 150-200 |
| Carpenters | 200-400 |
| Laborers | 400-700 |
| Millwrights | 130-200 |
| Electricians | 372 |
| Plumbers/Pipe Fitters | 150-250 |
| Masons | 65 |
| Painters/Insulater | 100 |
| Operators | 200 |

Source: ABTC, 2001

Construction Impacts on Population

Construction of the proposed project could affect the population of the area during the construction period only if a substantial number of workers had to relocate to the area because of the project. However, the average construction workforce of 485 persons is an insignificant portion of the available construction workforce of approximately 68,700 within Alameda County. Because the project is within commuting distance of most of Alameda County and parts of San Joaquin County, very few construction workers are expected to relocate as a result of project construction. Therefore, the TPP will not contribute to a significant increase in population in Alameda County or communities near the project.

Construction Impacts on Housing

The majority of the construction workforce is expected to commute rather than relocate for the 23 month construction period, construction of the proposed project is not expected to increase the demand for housing. While the construction workforce would most likely commute to the project site on a daily basis, there is an adequate amount of motel space available in the Livermore or Tracy area to accommodate those workers who might choose to commute to the project site on a work-week basis. Should project construction workers chose to relocate to the area, they would easily be accommodated given the current housing vacancy rate of 4.97 percent in Alameda County (CDOF, 2001).

Construction Impacts on Education

Construction of the TPP is not expected to have a significant impact on the education in the area. No significant population change is associated with the construction phase and therefore, there should be no influx of families with school aged children into the area. However, the property will be subject to pay the applicable property taxes and statutory facility fees associated with the issuance of a building permit. The project is located within the Tracy Unified and Mountain House Elementary School District that have a total school impact fee of

\$0.33 per square foot for commercial and industrial development. The covered and closed structures to be built will total approximately 9,000 square feet, which results in a \$2,970 school impact fee to be paid by TPP.

Construction Impacts on Recreation

Construction related activities are not expected to cause impacts to the surrounding local and regional recreational facilities.

Construction Impacts on Public Services and Facilities

The proposed project will not cause significant population changes or housing impacts in Alameda County, or San Joaquin County, and the project is not expected to cause construction-related increases in the demand for public services or facilities.

Construction Impacts on Fiscal Resources and Local Economy

During construction of the proposed project, an estimated \$18-20 million will be spent on local purchases.

5.8.2.2 Operational Impacts

Operation Impacts on Employment

When the proposed project is completed, it is estimated that approximately 36 people will be permanently employed at the site. The local area workforce is likely to supply most of the operational personnel. A local hiring policy will be practiced, however, a few staff (probably less than five people) with specialized skills and expertise to operate the electrical generation equipment may need to be relocated to eastern Alameda County. The small number of employees who may relocate is not expected to create a significant adverse impact.

Operational payroll for the TPP will have a positive impact on the eastern Alameda County area. Annual operational payroll, including all salaries, overtime, benefits, and incentives, is estimated to be \$3.4 million.

Operation Impacts on Population

A sufficient number of qualified personnel are available in the area to fill most of the operational positions, so the proposed project is not expected to significantly increase the population of the Alameda County. However, to assess the potential for long-term population impacts, a “worst case” could be assumed in which approximately 10 of the operational workers migrated to the Alameda area and that each worker’s family would average 2.8 persons, based on data compiled for California (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). Using these “worst case” assumptions, 28 additional persons could move to eastern Alameda County to operate the proposed facility.

In the “worst case” scenario described above, the addition of 28 people to an estimated Alameda County population of 1,443,741 would represent an insignificant increase to the current total population. While these additional people could locate near the proposed project site, they would most likely be dispersed throughout eastern Alameda County. Given the small size of the proposed operational workforce, the relatively large current population of the area, and the probability of dispersion, even long-term “worst case” operational impacts on population would be insignificant.

Operation Impacts on Housing

Under the “worst case” scenario where half of the operational workers would relocate to Alameda County, there would be a demand for 10 additional housing units. However, with an existing vacancy rate of 4.97 percent, approximately 26,897 units are currently available in the Alameda area (CDOF, 2001). Even under a “worst case” situation, adequate housing would be available for these personnel, based on existing vacancy rates. Accordingly, operation of the TPP will not increase the demand for housing in the Alameda area.

Operational Impacts on Education

Operation of the TPP will cause no significant impacts to the area schools due to the small number of permanent employees.

Operational Impacts on Recreation

Operation of the TPP will not cause significant impacts to local or regional recreational facilities due to the small number of permanent employees and remote location.

Operation Impacts on Public Services and Facilities

Operation of the TPP will not cause significant population changes in the area surrounding the project or Alameda County, or create a demand for additional housing, therefore no operational staff-related increase in demand for public services or facilities is expected. However, operation of the TPP could increase the need for plant-related services or facilities in the area, including water service, sewer service, and fire and police services as follows:

- The proposed project will require an average of approximately 5,100 acre-feet of water per year. Impacts to the water supply are discussed in section 5.4, Water Resources.
- The proposed facility will have two wastewater streams: process wastewater and sanitary wastewater. Process wastewater from the plant will be treated on-site using a zero discharge system. Sanitary waste will be disposed of in a county-approved sanitary disposal system, using septic tanks and a leach field. A more detailed description of these treatment processes is provided in Sections 3.4.6 and 3.4.7. The project will not impact the community sewer or wastewater collection and treatment system.

- On-site fire protection systems will be provided to limit the potential for injury, loss of life, property loss, and plant down time from a fire or an explosion. The systems in the facility, described in Section 3.4.10, will consist of fire water storage tanks, pumping systems, and a variety of suppression systems. On-site personnel will be trained to effectively deal with emergency situations and local fire authorities will be made familiar with the facility layout, hazardous materials, and evacuation routes. An Emergency Response and Waste Contingency Manual will be compiled and updated to ensure safe and effective firefighting measures on-site. When implemented, these on-site systems and measures are expected to reduce the fire hazard of these facilities and the potential impact to the ACFD. With these systems and measures in place, it is expected that the ACFD will be able to adequately respond to emergencies at the project site, even in the event of an emergency.
- TPP will provide security fencing and gates to prevent any unauthorized access to the project site or its facilities. Security personnel will also patrol the facility and its premises on a regular basis. By providing extensive on-site security, the demand on the Sheriff's Department will be reduced. In addition, the facility will be operated on a 24-hour basis, thus assuring that staff will be available on-site to respond to any emergencies. With these systems in place, it is expected that project operations would not affect the ability of the Alameda County Sheriff's Department to adequately respond and provide services to the project area.

Operation Impacts on Fiscal Resources and the Local Economy

Alameda County is the local agency with taxing power. Alameda County is part of the state's busiest urban area. It has an established major port for the Pacific Rim trade, and its diverse economic base includes manufacturing, services, and wholesale and retail businesses. For FY 2001, Alameda County's Board of Supervisors approved an annual budget of about \$1.6 billion.

The funding categories generally include the following County programs:

- General Government: Board of Supervisors, Public Works Agency, County Administrator, County Counsel, Assessor, Treasurer-Tax Collector, Registrar of Voters, Human Resources Services, Information Technology Department, general Services Agency, Auditor-Control Recorder, County Library
- Public Protection: District Attorney, Fire Department, Sheriffs Department, Trial Court Funding, Community Development Agency
- Public Assistance: Administration and Finance, Department of Welfare to Work, Department of Workforce and Resource, Children and Family Services, Department of Adult and Aging Services, Probation Department, Public Defender
- Health Services: Public Health Department, Behavioral Health Services, Other Health
- Public Ways and Facilities: Administration, Nutrition Services, Welfare
- Cultural, Recreation, and Educational Services

- Capital Projects: Major Maintenance, Underground Tank Removal, and Hazardous Materials Management Projects
- Contingency Reserves
- Non-Program Financing

Table 5.8-3 shows how the funds were allocated. Table 5.8-4 shows funding revenues for the County in FY 1999, FY 2000, and FY 2001.

**Table 5.8-3. Alameda County Budget Appropriations for
FY 1999, FY 2000, and FY 2001
(in Millions of Dollars)**

| Expenditures by Agency | FY 1999 (Final) | FY 2000 (Final) | FY 2001 (Final) |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| General Government | \$86.4 | \$108.1 | \$111.0 |
| Public Protection | \$347.5 | \$378.9 | \$404.4 |
| Public Assistance | \$476.2 | \$466.9 | \$481.2 |
| Health Care Services | \$354.7 | \$365.8 | \$385.6 |
| Public Ways and Facilities | \$39.0 | \$37.9 | \$46.6 |
| Cultural, Recreation, and Education Services | \$15.7 | \$15.3 | \$17.4 |
| Capital Projects | \$46.3 | \$130.8 | \$103.5 |
| Contingency Reserves | \$3.0 | \$5.4 | \$9.3 |
| Non-Program Financing | | | \$23.0 |
| Total Expenditures | \$1,368.8 | \$1,509.1 | \$1,582.0 |

Source: Alameda County Auditor Agency (2001).

Table 5.8-4. Alameda County Revenues, 1999 to 2001 (\$ Million)

| Expenditures by Agency | FY 1999 (Final) | FY 2000 (Final) | FY 2001 (Final) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Taxes – Current Property | \$151.0 | \$164.7 | \$186.4 |
| Taxes – Other than Current Property | \$131.0 | \$134.5 | \$146.5 |
| Licenses, Permits, Franchises | \$4.9 | \$5.4 | \$5.6 |
| Fines, Forfeitures, Penalties | \$14.5 | \$14.9 | \$14.6 |
| Revenue from Use of Money/Property | \$9.5 | \$9.4 | \$9.6 |
| Aid from State Government | \$472.3 | \$461.2 | \$478.0 |
| Aid from Federal Government | \$237.5 | \$273.8 | \$307.5 |
| Charges for Current Services | \$144.3 | \$168.9 | \$175.0 |
| Aid from Local Government Agencies | \$4.1 | \$4.1 | \$5.9 |
| Other Revenues | \$68.3 | \$89.4 | \$82.7 |
| Other Financing Sources | \$122.2 | \$177.6 | \$163.6 |
| Available Fund Balance | \$9.2 | \$5.3 | \$6.8 |
| Total Revenue | \$1,368.0 | \$1,509.0 | \$1,582.0 |

Source: Alameda County Auditor Agency (2001).

Based on the approximate \$600-700 million capital cost of the facility, Alameda County would initially expect to receive in excess of \$6 million in additional property tax annually. Based on current tax distribution rates, the distribution of taxes would be as shown in Table 5.8-5.

Table 5.8-5. Distribution of Annual Property Taxes Paid by the Project

| Property Tax Distribution | Percent | Tax |
|--|----------------|-------------|
| 1005 – County General Tax | 54.220255 | \$3,253,215 |
| 3001 – San Joaquin College | 3.641676 | 218,500 |
| 3048 – Mountain House School | 3.345518 | 200,731 |
| 3077 – Tracy Unified School District | 9.898072 | 593,884 |
| 3998 – Mountain House Area-wide | 6.273591 | 376,415 |
| 4006 – County Superintendent of School | 0.161324 | 9,679 |
| 4007 – County Superintendent of School | 0.600832 | 36,050 |
| 4008 – County Superintendent of School | 0.013410 | 805 |
| 4009 – County Superintendent of School | 0.081215 | 4,873 |
| 4010 – County Superintendent of School | 0.257632 | 15,458 |
| 4011 – County Superintendent of School | 0.053336 | 3,200 |
| 4012 – County Superintendent of School | 0.160146 | 9,608 |
| 4013 – County Superintendent of School | 0.123402 | 7,404 |
| 4015 – County Superintendent of School | 0.149808 | 8,988 |
| 4020 – County Superintendent of School | 0.032110 | 1,927 |
| 7005 – County Library | 6.895002 | 413,700 |

Table 5.8-5. Distribution of Annual Property Taxes Paid by the Project
(Continued)

| Property Tax Distribution | Percent | Tax |
|---|------------------|--------------------|
| 7006 – County Library District One | 0.243944 | 14,636 |
| 7010 – County Fire Department | 8.711701 | 522,702 |
| 7070 – County Flood | 0.324926 | 19,495 |
| 7106 – Flood Zone 7 State Water | 3.272311 | 196,339 |
| 7115 – Bay Area Air Quality Management | 0.325171 | 19,510 |
| 7135 – Mosquito Abatement | 0.216817 | 13,009 |
| 7165 – Bay Area Rapid Transit | 0.954815 | 57,289 |
| 7375 – Alameda County Resource Conservation | 0.042974 | 2,578 |
| Total | 99.999988 | \$5,999,995 |

Source: Alameda County Auditor Agency (2001).

The sales taxes to be paid by TPP on estimated local purchases of approximately \$0.5 million per year would be distributed as shown in Table 5.8-6.

Table 5.8-6. Distribution of Annual Sales Taxes Paid by the Project

| Sales Tax Distribution | Tax Rate | Amount of Tax |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| County General Fund | 1.25 | 5,000 |
| Alameda Transportation District | .50 | 2,500 |
| Bay Area Rapid Transit | .50 | 2,500 |
| State of California | 5.75 | 23,750 |
| Total | 8.00 | \$37,500 |

Source: State of California Board of Equalization (2001). D. Oldfield, personal communication.

In addition to increased tax revenues, local and regional spending by TPP will stimulate the creation of new jobs in the east Alameda County area and will have a positive fiscal and economic impact on the local area.

5.8.3 Environmental Justice Screening Analysis

The purpose of Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low Income Populations* (1994), is to identify disproportionate placement of adverse environmental, economic, social, or health impacts from federal actions and policies on minority and/or low-income communities. According to federal guidelines, a minority population is defined as a minority group that has a population of greater than 50 percent of the affected area's general population (EPA, 1998). The Order requires that impacts on minority or low-income populations be taken into account when preparing environmental and socioeconomic analysis of projects or programs that are proposed, funded, or licensed by federal agencies.

U.S. Census Bureau information on racial demographics in Alameda County indicates that, according to the 2000 census, approximately 48.9 percent of the county's population is white, and approximately 79.4 percent of the Livermore-Pleasanton County subdivision is white. Figure 5.15-3 (see Section 5.15, Public Health) illustrates the census tracts within six miles of the project site. A summary of population and race information for the five census tracts within six miles of the project site is presented in Table 5.8-7. U.S. Census Bureau Data for the nearby census tracts indicates that approximately 48.4 to 85.7 percent of the population is identified as white. The average white population is 61.8 percent. Therefore, environmental impacts are not likely to fall disproportionately on minority populations.

In keeping with the established Federal standards on minority populations, a low-income community is defined as one whose general population is comprised of 50 percent or more people living under the poverty threshold. Following the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB's) Directive 14, the U.S. Census Bureau uses a set of money income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to detect population segments identified as economically "below the poverty level." If the total income for a family or unrelated individual falls below the relevant poverty threshold, then the family or unrelated individual is classified as being "below the poverty level." This evaluation was performed using data from the 1990 census. Only certain data sets have been released for California, 2000 Census, and the necessary data is scheduled to be release no later than September 2002, but was not available at the time this document was prepared. Should the data become available during the review process this document will be amended to reflect the redistricting and other population data changes. A summary of population and race information for the five census tracts within six miles of the project site is presented in Table 5.8-7.

Table 5.8-7. Demographic Information for Census Tracts Near the Project Site

| Demographics | 3040⁽¹⁾ | 4511.01⁽¹⁾ | 39⁽¹⁾ | 52.03⁽¹⁾ | 55⁽¹⁾ |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| | <i>Contra Costa County</i> | <i>Alameda County</i> | <i>San Joaquin County</i> | <i>San Joaquin County</i> | <i>San Joaquin County</i> |
| Total Population (persons) | 10,882 | 4,613 | 2,435 | 8,252 | 6,876 |
| Race – Persons | | | | | |
| White (%) | 85.7 | 82.4 | 48.4 | 64.3 | 59.7 |
| Non-White (%) | 14.3 | 17.6 | 51.6 | 35.7 | 40.3 |
| Demographics | 3040⁽²⁾ | 4511⁽²⁾ | 39⁽²⁾ | 52.03⁽²⁾ | 55⁽²⁾ |
| | <i>Contra Costa County</i> | <i>Alameda County</i> | <i>San Joaquin County</i> | <i>San Joaquin County</i> | <i>San Joaquin County</i> |
| Number of Households | 2,679 | 1,165 | 520 | 1,172 | 900 |
| Household Income | | | | | |
| Number of Households Less Than \$17,500 ⁽³⁾ | 254 | 73 | 147 | 185 | 246 |
| Number of Households More Than \$17,500 | 2,481 | 1,109 | 391 | 867 | 692 |
| Median Household Income (\$) | 61,260 | 65,435 | 24,951 | 44,364 | 32,417 |

1 – Data from 2000 Census (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000)

2 – Data from 1990 Census (U.S. Census Bureau, 1990)

3 – \$17,050 is the poverty level for a family of four persons.

Of a total of 6,436 households reported in the nearest five 1990 census tracts, 905, or 14.1 percent, were below the poverty level. Since the percentage of people living under the poverty level is well below 50 percent, environmental impacts are not likely to fall disproportionately on low-income members of the community.

5.8.4 Mitigation Measures

There will be no significant adverse impacts on socioeconomics as a result of construction or operation of the TPP. Therefore, no mitigation is warranted.

5.8.5 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable adverse socioeconomic impacts are anticipated as a result of the TPP.

5.8.6 Cumulative Impacts

The potential for cumulative socioeconomic impacts exists when there are other projects proposed in the region that have overlapping construction schedules and project operations that could impact similar resources. Alameda County has been experiencing growth that has placed demands on the construction industry, however the average construction workforce of 485 persons is an insignificant portion of the available Alameda County construction workforce of approximately 67,800. Construction workers would also be available from the San Joaquin County cities of Tracy, Stockton and Modesto. TPP is being constructed within the general commuting distance of the greater Alameda County area and the Tracy-Stockton-Modesto area of San Joaquin County. Table 5.3-8 (see Section 5.3) provides a summary of the projects planned or approved for construction within 15 miles of TPP. Most of these projects will be completed before TPP begins construction in the second quarter of 2002. The East Altamont Energy Center power plant project located approximately six miles north of TPP may be constructed at approximately the same time as TPP and, if peak construction periods coincide, a shortage of some specialized construction crafts could be anticipated. These impacts are not expected to be significant.

The annual income and property tax revenues generated by TPP is expected to provide additional public resources and potential improvements that will outweigh any short-term impacts on public services. Overall, no adverse significant cumulative socioeconomic impacts are expected to occur from the construction or operation.

5.8.7 Applicable Laws, Ordinances, Regulations and Standards (LORS)

Design construction and operation of the TPP including transmission lines, pipelines, and ancillary facilities will be conducted in accordance with all LORS pertinent to socioeconomics.

The following LORS are applicable or potentially applicable to the TPP in the context of Federal Authorities and Administering Agencies

Executive Order 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.” The Order focuses federal attention on the environment and human health conditions of minority communities and calls on agencies to achieve environmental justice as part of their mission. The Order requires the EPA and all other federal agencies (as well as state agencies receiving federal funds) to develop strategies to address this problem. Agencies are required to identify and address any disproportionately high and/or adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and/or low income populations.

The administering agencies for the above authority are the EPA, Bureau of Land Management, California Energy Commission (CEC), and all other agencies involved with the proposed project.

5.8.7.1 State and Local Authorities and Administering Agencies

California Education Code § 17620; California Gov. Code § 65955 et seq. The code includes provisions for levies against new industrial construction within the boundaries of the school district for the construction or reconstruction of school facilities.

The administering agency for the above authority is the County of Alameda.

California Environmental Quality Act; California Public Resources Code § 25523(a)i 20 CCR & § 1752, 1752.5, 2300 - 2309, and Chapter 2. Subchapter 5, Appendix B, Part (i); 14 CCR § 15131. Under the California Resources Agency regulations for implementation of CEQA, economic or social effects of a project “shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment” but may be “used to determine the significance of physical changes caused by the Project” (14 CCR § 1513 1).

The administering agency for the above authorities is the CEC.

5.8.7.2 TPP Compliance With Socioeconomic LORS

The TPP will comply with federal, state and local LORS, which apply to Socioeconomics as described above. Table 6.1-1 (see Section 6.0) provides a summary of compliance with LORS.

5.8.8 Involved Agencies and Agency Contacts

Involved agencies and agency contacts are provided in Table 5.8-8.

Table 5.8-8. Involved Agencies and Agency Contacts

| Agency/Address | Contact/Telephone | Permits/Reason for Involvement |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Alameda County Superintendent of Schools 313 W. Winton Street Hayward, CA 94544 | Sheila Jordan (510) 887-0152 | School Enrollment |
| Alameda County Sheriff’s Department – Public Information 1401 Lakeside Drive, 12 th Floor Oakland, CA 94612 | Officer Jim Knudsen (510) 272-6901 | Police Service |

Table 5.8-8. Involved Agencies and Agency Contacts

| Agency/Address | Contact/Telephone | Permits/Reason for Involvement |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Alameda County Fire Department – Fire Prevention Bureau 835 E. 14 th Street San Leandro, CA 94577 | Bob Bowman (510) 670-5877 | Fire Prevention and Service |
| Alameda County Building Trades Council 8400 Enterprise, Room 205 Oakland, CA 94612 | Barry Luboviski (510) 430-8664 | Employment Resources |

5.8.9 Permits Required and Permit Schedule

No permits are required by any agency in the project area regarding potential socioeconomic impacts.

5.8.10 References

Alameda Building Trades Council. 2001. B. Luboviski, personal communication with M. dos Santos, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation.

Alameda County Auditor Agency. 2000. Alameda County Budget Summary.

Alameda County Auditor Agency. 2001. Alameda County Area Tax Rates.

Alameda County Fire Department. 2001. H. Franks, personal communication with M. dos Santos, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation.

Alameda County Sheriff's Department. 2001. B. Bassett, personal communication with M. dos Santos, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation.

California Department of Finance (CDOF), Demographics Research Unit. 2001.
(<http://www.dof.ca.gov/html/Demograp/druhpar.htm>)

City of Tracy. 2001. Tracy Park System. (<http://www.ci.tracy.ca.us/parks-listing.html>)

Livermore Area Recreation & Park District (LARPD). 2001.
(<http://www.larpd.dst.ca.us/index.html>)

Mountain House Elementary School District. 2001. D. Kuhn, personal communication with M. dos Santos, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation.

State of California Board of Equalization. 2001. D. Oldfield, personal communication with M. dos Santos, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation.

State of California, Employment Development Department. 2001.
(<http://www.edd.cahwnet.gov/>)

Tracy Unified School District. 2001. (<http://www.tracy.k12.ca.us/>)

U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census. 1990. (<http://www.census.gov>)

U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census. 2000. (<http://www.census.gov>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Federal Activities. 1998. Final Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA's NEPA Compliance.

MAP POCKET