

## **III.23 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE**

This chapter describes the laws and regulations that govern socioeconomic and environmental justice issues. It also describes the existing environment within the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (DRECP or Plan) area regarding socioeconomics (including community workforce, available housing, and fiscal status of Plan Area counties) and environmental justice (including data on existing minority and low-income communities). Appendix R1.23 provides supporting information for this chapter, specifically two maps and one table. The maps illustrate the locations of census tracts identified as containing minority and low-income populations relevant to the environmental justice analysis, and the table presents demographic data used in this analysis.

### **III.23.1 Regulatory Setting**

#### **III.23.1.1 Federal**

##### **Executive Order 12898**

In 1994 President Clinton issued the Executive Order, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, to focus federal attention on environmental and human health conditions in minority and low-income communities. EO 12898 promotes nondiscrimination in federal programs that substantially affect human health and the environment, and it provides information access and public participation relating to these matters. This order requires federal agencies (and state agencies receiving federal funds) to identify and address any disproportionately high or adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and/or low-income populations. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) oversees federal compliance with EO 12898.

##### **Council on Environmental Quality's Environmental Justice Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act**

To ensure that environmental justice concerns are effectively identified and addressed according to EO 12898, the CEQ, in consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), developed guidance to assist federal agencies to implement procedures. According to the CEQ's "Environmental Justice Guidance Under NEPA," agencies should consider the composition of affected areas to determine whether minority or low-income populations are affected by a proposed action, and, if so, whether those environmental effects may be disproportionately high or adverse (CEQ 1997).

According to the CEQ environmental justice guidelines, minority populations should be identified if:

- A minority population percentage either exceeds 50% of the population of the affected area, or
- If the minority population percentage of the affected area is meaningfully greater than the minority population percentage in the general population or other appropriate unit of geographic analysis (e.g., a governing body's jurisdiction, neighborhood census tract, or other similar unit).

### **Environmental Protection Agency Final Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA's Compliance Analyses**

EPA's "Final Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA's Compliance Analyses" defines how EPA will ensure that disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority communities and low-income communities are identified and addressed. It establishes agency-wide goals for engaging American Indian, Alaska Native, and other indigenous peoples (e.g., Native Hawaiian). It also establishes agency-wide goals for environmental protection and lists actions the EPA would take to incorporate environmental justice into its mission (EPA 1998).

### **Environmental Protection Agency Plan Environmental Justice 2014**

EPA's Plan Environmental Justice (EJ) 2014 is a strategy to help the agency integrate environmental justice into its programs, policies, and activities. Plan EJ 2014 identifies Cross-Agency Focus Areas, Tools Development, and Program Initiatives as the three essential elements that will advance environmental justice across the EPA and other agencies of the federal government. Plan EJ 2014 is not yet a rule or regulation and is currently under development (EPA 2011).

### **Bureau of Land Management Land Use Planning Handbook, Appendix D**

The Plan Area includes the following Department of Interior (DOI) Bureau of Land Management (BLM) field office jurisdictions:

- Bakersfield
- Ridgecrest
- Barstow
- Needles
- Palm Springs/South Coast
- El Centro

Appendix D (Social Science Considerations in Land Use Planning Decisions) of the BLM Land Use Planning Handbook provides guidance on integrating social science information into the planning process for projects within BLM lands. Any information gathered for planning purposes must be considered in the context of BLM's legal mandates. To be effective, social scientific data and methods identified in Appendix D must be integrated into the entire planning process (BLM 2005). Furthermore, Section IV (Environmental Justice Requirements) of Appendix D provides guidance for assessing potential impacts on population, housing, and employment as they relate to environmental justice. It also describes variables such as lifestyles, beliefs and attitudes, and social organizations with respect to environmental justice.

### **U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Human Use and Economic Evaluation Procedures (1985)**

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife's (USFWS) Human Use and Economic Evaluation procedures can help evaluate any project that affects fish and wildlife resources. These procedures provide the means to determine both the extent of human uses of wildlife and the dollar value of those uses (USFWS 1985). The procedures incorporate a concern for how much human activity wildlife can tolerate. Data produced is useful in comparing the effects of proposed actions on human uses of wildlife and in preparing benefit/cost analyses.

#### **III.23.1.2 State**

### **California Assembly Bill (AB) 1451 (Solar Energy Project Tax Exemption)**

Before passage of AB 1099 in 2005, existing law excluded the construction or addition of active solar energy systems from the definition of "new construction." Assembly Bill 1451 extended that exclusion for new construction of solar energy systems, which is now set to expire on January 1, 2017 (State of California 2013a). Consequently, solar energy projects are required to pay property taxes on certain components of their projects such as administrative offices and maintenance areas. These projects are also required to pay 25% of the cash value of pipes and ducts used to carry electricity generated from solar facilities. The solar energy system itself is excluded from the definition of new construction and the assessment of property taxes on that system. If a project begins construction before the January 1, 2017, expiration date, it is eligible for the exclusion. After that date, any solar energy system constructed remains exempt from property tax as long as the property does not change ownership. Neither the property owner nor the State is responsible for reimbursing local agencies for tax revenues lost because of this exclusion.

### **California Resources Agency Environmental Justice Policy (Government Code Section 65040.12 and Public Resources Code Section 72000)**

The Resources Agency promotes the principles of environmental justice through the incorporation of such principles in all Resources Agency programs, policies, and activities. All Departments, Boards, Commissions, Conservancies and Special Programs of the Resources Agency must consider environmental justice in their decision-making process if their actions have an impact on the environment, environmental laws or policies (California 2013b and c). Actions that require environmental justice consideration include, adopting regulations, enforcing environmental laws or regulations, making discretionary decisions or taking actions that affect the environment, providing funding for activities affecting the environment, and interacting with the public on environmental issues. The intent of this policy is to ensure that the public, including minority and low-income populations, are not discriminated against, treated unfairly, or experience disproportionate adverse impacts from environmental decisions.

#### **III.23.1.3 Regional**

The following describes only those regional governmental agencies with plans and policies pertaining to socioeconomic resources applicable to the Plan Area.

##### **Kern Council of Governments**

The Kern COG acts as an area-wide planning agency to assist local governments with multijurisdictional issues such as air quality, transportation, water quality, energy, and housing. The Kern COG primarily addresses regional transportation issues and functions as the state-designated Census Data Center Affiliate for the Kern Region. The Kern COG and its member agencies include the Kern County itself and the 11 incorporated cities within Kern County (Kern COG 2012). The Kern COG facilitates comprehensive planning and intergovernmental coordination.

Under California housing law, the California Department of Housing and Community Development estimates the relative share of California's projected population growth that will result in each county in the state based on California Department of Finance population projections and historical growth trends. Based upon the projected growth in the number of households in Kern County between 2008 and 2013, the California Department of Housing and Community Development calculated the number of additional units needed during that period. In turn, the Kern COG is required by state law to determine the portion of funding for regional housing to be allocated to each jurisdiction within the region.

To do this, the Kern COG developed its Regional Housing Needs Assessment for the period between 2006 and 2013. This assessment addresses all housing needs for all income levels

in the Kern region. The Kern COG is required to assign regional housing shares to the cities within its region on a similar 5-year schedule. These shares of regional need are allocated before the end of the cycle so that cities and counties can amend their housing elements by the deadline. The Kern COG has determined that additional housing construction needed by 2013 is 42,640 units for the entire county, and 8,586 units for unincorporated areas of the county (Kern COG 2006).

### **Southern California Association of Governments—Regional Housing Needs Assessment (2007)**

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the nation's largest metropolitan planning organization, and represents 6 counties, 191 cities and more than 18 million residents. SCAG's region encompasses Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura counties. Its Regional Housing Needs Assessment is mandated by state law and is part of the periodic process of updating local housing elements in the General Plan. The Regional Housing Needs Assessment quantifies the need for housing within each jurisdiction during specific planning periods. The most recently completed Regional Housing Needs Assessment planning period is January 1, 2006, to June 30, 2014 (SCAG 2009). The 2007 Regional Housing Needs Assessment identified the following housing needs within the SCAG region (SCAG 2007): 165,457 (very low-income household units), 113,649 (low-income household units), 126,715 (moderate-income household units), and 293,547 (above moderate-income household units).

### **San Diego Association of Governments—Regional Housing Needs Assessment 2010–2020**

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is an association of local San Diego governments. It is the metropolitan planning organization for the county, and its policy makers include mayors, council members, and county supervisors. The 18 cities and county governments that make up SANDAG are a primary forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transportation, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life.

On February 26, 2010, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the final 2050 Regional Growth Forecast for planning and preparing the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan, the Sustainable Communities Strategy, and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment. The 2010-2020 Regional Housing Needs Assessment allocates the total number of housing units by income category: very low, low, moderate, or above moderate. These calculations will guide both the 18 cities in the county and the county itself as they plan through their housing elements. Data from the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan demonstrate that the San Diego region has the ability to accommodate its overall Regional Housing Needs Assessment

determination of 161,980 housing units, with a lower-income Regional Housing Needs Assessment of 64,150 units, 36,450 very low-income units, and 27,700 low-income units.

The 2050 Forecast projects the construction of 169,528 housing units between January 1, 2010, and January 1, 2025 (SANDAG 2010). The forecast also anticipates a capacity of more than 200,000 housing units in the category of 30 dwelling-units-per-acre or greater (based primarily on existing general/community plans and policies). This demonstrates that the region has more than enough sites planned to address its Regional Housing Needs Assessment lower-income housing need for 64,150 housing units (SANDAG 2010).

### **III.23.1.4 Local**

#### **General Plan Housing Elements**

In accordance with state law, each local municipality general plan housing element must be consistent and compatible with other general plan elements. Housing elements must also provide clear policy and direction for making decisions pertaining to zoning, subdivision approval, housing allocations, and capital improvements. State law (Government Code Sections 65580 through 65589) mandates the contents of housing elements. By law, a housing element must contain:

- An assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to meeting those needs.
- A statement of the community's goals, quantified objectives, and policies relevant to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing.
- A program that sets forth a 5-year schedule of actions that the local government is undertaking or intends to undertake to implement the policies and achieve the goals and objectives of housing elements.

A housing element must identify existing and projected housing needs and establish goals, policies, objectives, and programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing to meet the needs of all economic sectors of a community. It must assess both current and future housing needs and the constraints in meeting those needs; it must also provide a strategy to establish local housing goals and policies and set forth programs to accomplish those goals and policies.

The following specific general plan housing elements are applicable in the Plan Area:

- Imperial County 2008–2014 Housing Element
- Inyo County 2009–2014 Housing Element

- Kern County 2008–2013 Housing Element
- Los Angeles County 2008–2013 Housing Element
- Riverside County 2000–2005 Housing Element (currently being updated)
- San Bernardino County 2007–2012 Housing Element
- San Diego County 2005–2010 Housing Element (currently being updated)

### **General Plan Economic Development Elements**

An economic development element guides a county as it expands the local economy, which in turn provides jobs, attracts and retains businesses, supports diverse and vibrant commercial areas, and brings in sufficient revenue to support local programs and services. Because this element (unlike a housing element) is not state mandated, the State has not set forth requirements for it. However, the State has provided a list of suggested issues that economic development elements may address, including business retention and development by sector, employment development, business recruitment, fiscal stability, and budgetary structure.

The following items apply to economic development elements and other countywide policies that pertain to renewable energy development:

- Inyo County General Plan 2001 Economic Development Element
- Los Angeles County Draft General Plan 2035 Economic Development Element
- San Bernardino County General Plan 2007 Economic Development Element
- Inyo County Title 21 Renewable Energy Development Ordinance. (Note: while not a part of Inyo County’s General Plan Element, the Renewable Energy Ordinance, adopted August 17, 2010, supports, encourages, and regulates the development of the county’s solar and wind resources while protecting the health, safety and welfare of its residents and the environment.)
- Riverside County Board of Supervisors Policy Number-29 (B-29). While not an official part of Riverside County’s General Plan Element, this policy applies to energy development on all private land within Riverside County.

### **III.23.2 Social and Economic Conditions**

This section describes existing social and economic conditions in the Plan Area. The NEPA “affected environment” and the CEQA “environmental setting” together comprise the overall environmental setting against which the Plan’s effects are considered and ultimately judged. These terms therefore signify a discussion of existing conditions with respect to

socioeconomic resources and environmental justice populations. This section uses best-available recent data to establish those existing socioeconomic resource conditions in environmental justice populations.

This chapter features a different format than other chapters in this volume because socioeconomic and demographic resources are typically evaluated with quantitative and qualitative demographic data and social factors. The information presented here is organized to best support a combination quantitative and qualitative programmatic methodology based on various socioeconomic factors (community workforce, available housing, fiscal status of Plan Area counties, etc.).

The Plan Area contains approximately 22.5 million acres of land within parts of seven California counties: Imperial, Inyo, Kern, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, and San Diego. In presenting existing conditions of socioeconomic resources in environmental justice populations, unique considerations create differing “Study Area” boundaries for each socioeconomic resource area. For example, the Study Area for employment serving the Plan Area extends beyond the DRECP boundary. This is because construction personnel will come from outside the DRECP boundary to work on future renewable projects within the Plan boundary. However, the study area for the housing serving those workers is also within the Plan Area. Section III.23.2.1 discusses individual socioeconomic resources and the assumptions used to define each applicable study area. Following the identification of these study areas, available and representative existing (and when available, forecasted) demographic data are presented.

### **III.23.2.1 Socioeconomic Study Areas**

Due to the size of the Plan Area, the terms “regional” and “localized” study areas are used when referring to the geographic extent of socioeconomic resources and environmental justice populations within the Plan Area. For example, Riverside County is considered a regional study area, and the city of Blythe (contained within Riverside County) is a localized study area. For environmental justice demographics, the local study area is further reduced to the U.S. Census Tract level. Regional and local study areas are not defined boundaries but are population centers with associated socioeconomic-specific resources. This distinction is important because of geography, the nature of the resource, and because the demographics of a local study area may be different from the region itself. These study areas are separate from ecoregion subarea boundaries (Section III.23.5). Each socioeconomic and environmental justice resource (e.g., population, housing) therefore has study areas in tandem with the overall Plan Area environmental setting. Some socioeconomic study areas also extend Outside the Plan Area (e.g., employment).

To determine whether implementation of the DRECP would promote either population growth or otherwise affect existing housing availability, this analysis considers both existing and planned population growth, the availability of the local workforce, and housing conditions in the Plan Area. It is assumed that construction and operations workers will live within the regional (counties) and local (cities and communities) study areas to work on renewable energy projects to be built and operated within the Plan Area. Based on this assumption, the regional study area for population growth and housing demand (due to worker in-migration) would be the seven counties within the Plan Area.

Future renewable energy and infrastructure projects within the western portion of the Plan Area would be near the cities of Los Angeles and San Diego, and projects along the eastern Plan Area boundary would be near the Las Vegas and western Arizona areas. These cities are outside of the Plan Area, but some construction workers will likely come from these adjacent cities. These major metropolitan outlying areas, as well as those within the Plan Area, are therefore included within the employment study area and within both the regional and local study areas for workforce existing conditions. These metropolitan statistical areas are geographic entities defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. They contain a core urban area of 50,000 or more, and are made up of one or more counties, including counties containing the core urban area, as well as adjacent counties with a high degree of social and economic integration (as measured by commuting and employment) with the urban core (U.S. Census Bureau 2012a).

To better focus the localized socioeconomic study area, those incorporated cities and communities within the Plan Area with a population of 10,000 or more are identified. While some construction workers may stay in smaller communities, these larger incorporated areas would likely provide the most opportunity for vacant/temporary housing and living amenities. This analysis does not exclude the programmatic socioeconomic analysis of considering potential impacts to smaller rural communities with populations less than 10,000. However, socioeconomic baseline condition data is not presented or analyzed in detail at this smaller level (due to the larger programmatic nature of this document). Such smaller localized and site-specific analyses, when applicable, would occur during future project-level environmental reviews. See Chapter IV, Section IV.23.1.1.3, Future Project-Level Analyses, for more information.

To define existing public finance conditions, this section focuses on counties and major landholders within the Plan Area. Future renewable energy and necessary infrastructure projects within the Plan Area could directly affect the tax revenue of these counties, BLM, and other lands under federal jurisdiction. Similar to employment, the regional study area is considered a local study area in terms of public finance.

The Lead Agencies have determined that October 15, 2013, is the baseline date for this environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (EIR/EIS) (Section III.1.3.3). The baseline includes more than 50 renewable energy projects within the Plan Area, listed in Appendix O. The DRECP recommends permitting of up to approximately 20,000 MW of renewable energy projects, in addition to those existing projects. As shown in Appendix O, Table 2, the majority of baseline projects are located within DRECP proposed Development Focused Areas (DFAs). Therefore, it is likely that these projects are already influencing temporary population growth, available workforce and housing, and local economies, as discussed below in Sections III.23.2.2 through III.23.2.5. Individual environmental impact assessments of the baseline projects identified in Appendix O were conducted during their respective NEPA and/or CEQA assessments.

### III.23.2.2 Population

Table III.23-1 summarizes the current and forecasted population trends for all seven counties and the local study area cities within the Plan Area. Significant growth is forecasted for all seven counties. No localized population centers are located within either Inyo or San Diego counties, based on the small amount of land contained within the Plan Area.

**Table III.23-1  
2013 Population Profile and Projections for the Plan Area**

Area	2013 Population	2020 Projected Population	2030 Projected Population	2040 Projected Population
<i>Imperial County, CA</i>	180,061	222,920	259,339	294,585
Brawley	25,906	N/A	N/A	N/A
Calexico	40,493	N/A	N/A	N/A
El Centro	44,327	N/A	N/A	N/A
Imperial	166,148	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Inyo County, CA</i>	18,573	19,350	20,428	22,009
<i>Kern County, CA</i>	857,882	1,057,440	1,341,278	1,618,681
California City	13,150	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ridgecrest	28,348	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tehachapi	13,313	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Los Angeles County, CA</i>	9,958,091	10,441,441	10,950,335	11,243,022
Lancaster	158,630	N/A	N/A	N/A
Palmdale	154,535	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Riverside County, CA</i>	2,555,059	2,593,211	3,046,064	3,462,256
Blythe	19,606	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>San Bernardino County, CA</i>	2,076,274	2,273,017	2,626,945	2,988,648
Adelanto	31,289	N/A	N/A	N/A
Apple Valley	70,436	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Table III.23-1  
2013 Population Profile and Projections for the Plan Area**

Area	2013 Population	2020 Projected Population	2030 Projected Population	2040 Projected Population
Barstow	23,168	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hesperia	91,400	N/A	N/A	N/A
Twentynine Palms	26,084	N/A	N/A	N/A
Victorville	120,368	N/A	N/A	N/A
Yucca Valley	21,030	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>San Diego County, CA</i>	<i>3,150,178</i>	<i>3,333,995</i>	<i>3,530,896</i>	<i>3,749,240</i>

N/A= Data unavailable.

Source: California Department of Finance 2013a and 2013b

### III.23.2.3 Housing

Table III.23-2 summarizes year 2013 housing unit availability for all seven counties within the Plan Area and the local study area cities within. The regional study area contains a high number of housing units though vacancy rates fluctuate significantly within each localized area.

**Table III.23-2  
2013 Housing Profile of the Plan Area Regional and Local Study Areas**

Area	Total Housing Units	Vacancy Units (Vacancy Rate %)
<i>Imperial County, CA</i>	<i>56,524</i>	<i>6,952 (12.3%)</i>
Brawley	8,248	610 (7.4%)
Calexico	10,791	540 (5.0%)
El Centro	14,547	1,382 (9.5%)
Imperial	5,017	366 (7.3%)
<i>Inyo County, CA</i>	<i>9,491</i>	<i>1,433 (15.1%)</i>
<i>Kern County, CA</i>	<i>288,624</i>	<i>30,017 (10.4%)</i>
California City	5,226	1,113 (21.3%)
Ridgecrest	12,088	1,160 (9.6%)
Tehachapi	3,622	428 (11.8%)
<i>Los Angeles County, CA</i>	<i>3,463,382</i>	<i>204,339 (5.9%)</i>
Lancaster	52,334	4,867 (9.3%)
Palmdale	46,680	3,594 (7.7%)
<i>Riverside County, CA</i>	<i>812,234</i>	<i>116,149 (14.3%)</i>
Blythe	5,472	958 (17.5%)
<i>San Bernardino County, CA</i>	<i>704,540</i>	<i>88,068 (12.5%)</i>
Adelanto	9,235	1,302 (14.1%)
Apple Valley	28,259	2,713 (9.6%)

**Table III.23-2  
2013 Housing Profile of the Plan Area Regional and Local Study Areas**

Area	Total Housing Units	Vacancy Units (Vacancy Rate %)
Barstow	9,632	1,474 (15.3%)
Hesperia	29,009	2,582 (8.9%)
Twentynine Palms	9,651	1,303 (13.5%)
Victorville	37,427	4,192 (11.2%)
Yucca Valley	9,583	1,284 (13.4%)
<i>San Diego County, CA</i>	<i>1,174,866</i>	<i>77,541 (6.6%)</i>

N/A= Data unavailable.

Source: California Department of Finance 2013b

### Short-Term Temporary Housing

It is assumed that construction workers will increase both long- and short-term housing demand within the Plan Area (III.23.2.1). Table III.23-2 shows all housing, including owner-occupied and rental units. Based on the physical distribution of population centers within the Plan Area, the primary focuses of housing demand are Riverside, San Bernardino, and Imperial counties. This determination is because these counties contain most of the Plan Area, and workers seeking temporary housing would be close enough to work on local renewable energy projects. A significant percentage of these three counties also contain BLM- and other federal agency-administered lands. Given the size of the Plan Area and these three key counties, it is assumed that a high number of short-term temporary housing units (hotels, motels, and recreational vehicle parks) would be available within the Plan Area. Due to the commercial nature of this type of short-term temporary housing and the overall size of the Plan Area, accurate data regarding the total number of hotel/motel rooms and RV spaces are not available.

The BLM operates campgrounds throughout the Plan Area. Except for areas with specific camping regulations, vehicle camping is allowed anywhere on BLM-administered land within 300 feet of any posted open route (BLM 2012a). There is a 14-day limit for camping in any one location. After 14 days, campers wishing to stay in the area longer are required to move 25 miles from their original campsite. Long-term camping is available by permit in visitor areas on BLM lands, but because these areas are for recreational use only, workers would not be permitted to live in these areas (BLM 2012a). Camping is also allowed on U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands within the Plan Area. USFS reservation campgrounds are operated on a first-come, first-served basis. The maximum stay in most USFS campgrounds is 14 days, with a 21-day maximum stay per ranger district per calendar year (USFS 2012).

#### **III.23.2.4 Employment**

Table III.23-3 summarizes years 2008-2018 and 2010-2020 projections of employment by industry type within each Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). These areas define both the regional and local study areas for employment. As shown, the study area yields an impressive workforce; a high number of skilled workers are therefore anticipated for renewable energy projects and infrastructure construction and operation.

**Table III.23-3  
 Employment Profile of the Plan Area Regional Study Areas**

<b>Regional Study Area</b>	<b>Year 2008 or 2010: Total Workforce</b>	<b>Year 2008 or 2010: Construction Occupations<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Year 2008 or 2010: Electrical Infrastructure Operations<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Year 2018 or 2020: Projections Total Workforce</b>	<b>Year 2018 or 2020: Projections Construction Occupations<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Year 2018 or 2020: Electrical Infrastructure Operations<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Year 2013: Unemployment by County (%)</b>
Imperial County, CA (El Centro MSA): 2008-2018	64,900	2,350	600	70,500	2,640	630	24.2
Inyo County, CA (Eastern Sierra MSA): 2008-2018	17,310	1,220	100	18,690	1,240	110	7.5
Kern County, CA (Bakersfield MSA): 2010-2020	299,600	26,340	2,020	355,300	32,920	2,310	12.1
Los Angeles County, CA (Los Angeles MSA): 2010-2020	4,246,700	196,480	8,780	4,904,300	225,140	9,110	9.3
Riverside and San Bernardino counties, CA (Riverside–San Bernardino–Ontario MSA): 2010-2020	1,253,300	80,470	2,210	1,460,000	88,280	2,400	9.6 (Riverside) 9.6 (San Bernardino)
San Diego County, CA (San Diego–Carlsbad–San Marcos MSA): 2010-2020	1,360,100	102,420	2,160	1,619,900	123,700	2,460	7.0
Clark County, NV (Las Vegas MSA): 2010-2020	842,544	54,678	3,775	938,273	63,807	4,211	9.6

**Table III.23-3  
Employment Profile of the Plan Area Regional Study Areas**

Regional Study Area	Year 2008 or 2010: Total Workforce	Year 2008 or 2010: Construction Occupations <sup>1</sup>	Year 2008 or 2010: Electrical Infrastructure Operations <sup>2</sup>	Year 2018 or 2020: Projections Total Workforce	Year 2018 or 2020: Projections Construction Occupations <sup>1</sup>	Year 2018 or 2020: Electrical Infrastructure Operations <sup>2</sup>	Year 2013: Unemployment by County (%)
La Paz County, AZ (Lake Havasu–Kingman MSA): 2010	44,050	2,240	90	N/A	N/A	N/A	9.5
Yuma County, AZ (Yuma MSA): 2010	55,720	4,440	130	N/A	N/A	N/A	29.3

**Notes:** MSA = Metropolitan Statistical Area

<sup>1</sup> Includes those identified in the Construction Management, Architecture and Engineering, and the Construction and Extraction trades.

<sup>2</sup> Includes those identified in the Plant System Operators, Power Distributors and Dispatchers, Power Plant Operators, and Plant and System Operators trades.

**Source:** California Economic Development Department 2013a and 2013b; Nevada Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation (NDETR) 2013a and 2013b; Arizona Department of Administration ADAO 2013a and 2013b

### III.23.2.5 Public Finance

#### III.23.2.5.1 Bureau of Land Management

In 2012 (the most current data available), the BLM's national budget was \$1.1 billion, which supported 10,609 full-time equivalent staff. The majority of the BLM budget supports the management of lands and resources. Major funding sources come from oil and gas permit processing funds, recreation fees, and miscellaneous permanent payments. The BLM is one of a handful of agencies that raises more than four times its operating budget in outside fees. With a budget of \$1.1 billion, BLM-managed public lands generated nearly \$5.7 billion in 2012.

A portion of BLM's 2012 budget was the New Energy Frontier Initiative. As part of this initiative, the BLM promotes and facilitates the development of renewable energy facilities on public lands. The 2012 budget for renewable energy included an increase of \$3 million, intended to focus on the environmental elements of renewable energy project proposals. The 2012 budget also maintained BLM's capacity to manage conventional energy development on public lands, but reflects evolving changes in the sources of funding for BLM's energy programs (BLM 2012b).

The abundance of natural resources on BLM-administered public lands throughout California supports families, local communities, and economies. Traditional uses of these public lands including mining, grazing, and timber harvesting, now blend with activities such as outdoor recreation and energy production. In fiscal year 2012, recreation and other activities on BLM-administered public lands contributed more than \$2.5 billion to local and state economies and supported more than 9,600 California jobs (BLM 2013). Specific highlights of BLM's recent economic contributions within California include (BLM 2013):

- **Solar Energy:** Processing 22 applications encompassing 309,000 acres; 3 authorized solar facilities in construction, totaling 1,170 megawatts (MW) of production; 1,700 additional MW authorized in three projects; potential to collect \$23 million in annual rent during production. These include the Desert Sunlight Solar Farm, Genesis NextEra, and Ivanpah Solar Generating Station projects, identified in Appendix O as environmental baseline.
- **Wind Energy:** 1,373 turbines authorized, producing 828 MW in 27 rights-of-way on 28,800 acres (capable of producing more than \$1.8 million in annual rent), and processing 9 development applications on 58,200 acres. This includes the Alta East Wind project, identified in Appendix O as environmental baseline.
- **Geothermal:** 420 MW; 3.1 billion kilowatt/hours of electricity; 6 producing fields; 99 leases; 31 power plants; \$8.4 million in royalties.

- **Biomass:** Western juniper initiative under way, approximately 45,000 tons of biomass offered annually.
- **Right of Way (ROW):** Approximately 12,000 linear miles of ROW, including 2,227 road authorizations and 2,054 authorizations for power and telephone lines.
- **Payments in Lieu of Taxes:** The BLM distributed \$40.3 million of “payments in lieu of taxes” to compensate California counties and local governments for nontaxable federal lands in their jurisdictions.

#### ***III.23.2.5.2 California Energy Commission***

The California Energy Commission (CEC) has received \$314.5 million for energy efficiency and renewable energy programs (CEC 2012). The CEC administers four programs: the State Energy Program (\$226 million), the Energy Efficiency Conservation Block Grant Program (\$49.6 million), Appliance Rebate Program (\$35.2 million), and Energy Assurance Planning Program (\$3.6 million). The CEC is committed to five specific principles and priorities in awarding the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) stimulus funding for energy programs, which allow the CEC to leverage more dollars, distribute the funds throughout the state more effectively, and better align the intentions of federal ARRA legislation. These CEC public finance initiatives aim to (CEC 2012):

- Stimulate the economy and create and retain jobs in California.
- Achieve lasting and measurable energy benefits.
- Spend money efficiently, with accountability and minimal administrative burdens.
- Contribute to meeting California’s energy and environmental policy goals.
- Leverage other federal, state, local, and private financing through partnerships.

#### ***III.23.2.5.3 Local Government Services***

Table III.23-4 summarizes fiscal year 2011–2012 municipal budgets (most current available data) for each of the seven counties within the Plan Area. It also itemizes revenue and allocation sources of interest to socioeconomic stimuli in the proposed Plan Area (where available). The purpose of this baseline data is to establish the revenue and expenditure base of these communities. Environmental baseline and analysis specific to public service levels (fire, police, schools, parks, etc.) is not part of the socioeconomic analysis. Refer to the public services (Chapter III.22) and recreational analyses (Chapter III.18) within this DRECP and EIR/EIS for those particular topics. For a discussion of potential impacts to roadway capacity and service, see Chapter III.19, Transportation and Public Access.

**Table III.23-4  
Fiscal Year 2011–2012 Municipal Budgets for Local Governments  
Within the Plan Area**

Area	Total Revenue	Total Expenditures
Imperial County, CA	\$480,310,614 (8.1% from Taxes) (<1% from Licenses & Permits)	\$480,310,614
Inyo County, CA	\$70,344,227 (32.6% from Taxes) (<1% from Licenses & Permits)	\$77,865,291 (2.1% Education and Parks)
Kern County, CA	\$1,641,443,794 (23.2 % from Taxes) (1.1% from Licenses & Permits)	\$1,641,443,794 (4.9% Public Ways & Facilities) (0.8 % Recreation and Cultural) (0.5 % Education)
Los Angeles County, CA	\$23,300,000,000 (20% from Taxes)	\$23,300,000,000 (1.4 % Recreation and Cultural)
Riverside County, CA	\$4,397,700,000 (10.4% from Taxes) (<1% Licenses & Permits)	\$4,783,900,000 (<1% Parks and Open Space)
San Bernardino County, CA	\$3,314,395,474 (17.3 % from taxes)	\$3,982,031,175
San Diego County, CA	\$4,086,000,000 (19.3 % from Taxes)	\$4,086,000,000 (8.6 % Land Use and Environment)

### III.23.3 Community and Social Organization

#### III.23.3.1 Study Area

Based on guidance from Appendix D of the BLM Land Use Planning Handbook, the study area for this specific discussion (within the overall Plan Area) should include gateway communities, natural resource-dependent communities, and wild land–urban interfaces. Given the programmatic nature of this EIR/EIS, these localized community discussions are not applicable to this socioeconomic analysis because of their site-specific nature. These localized community analyses will be appropriately conducted together with supplemental renewable energy project-specific NEPA reviews within the Plan Area where BLM is the federal lead agency. A discussion of Native American populations and lands appears elsewhere in this volume; including Environmental Justice concerns as they specifically relate to Native American populations (refer to Chapter III.9, Native American Interests). The following section complies with the applicable component of the BLM Land Use Planning Handbook Appendix D requirements in determining social values and community attitudes toward renewable energy development (for the entire Plan Area).

### **III.23.3.2 Social Values and Community Attitudes Toward Renewable Energy Development**

In 2002 California established the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) with the goal of increasing the percentage of renewable energy in the state's electricity mix to 20% of retail sales by 2017. The current RPS applies to all electricity retailers in the state including publicly owned utilities, investor-owned utilities, electricity service providers, and community choice aggregators. All of these entities must adopt these RPS goals of 20% of retail sales from renewables by the end of 2013, 25% by the end of 2016, and 33% by the end of 2020.

RPS goals and mandates were developed at the state level, and an interpretation of public values and attitudes toward renewable energy development only within the Plan Area would be speculative. However, it can be assumed that California communities (including those within the Plan Area) understand that adherence to this regulation requires the use of natural resources and public lands for renewable energy project development needed to achieve these goals. Therefore, in an effort to categorize the social values and attitudes toward renewable energy development, this Plan considers public comment and participation throughout the environmental baseline renewable energy project (refer to Appendix O) and the DRECP environmental review and planning process.

Throughout individual renewable energy project approvals and during environmental review and approval processes, the BLM, CEC, and other local jurisdictions have solicited and received public perception and input regarding renewable energy project development within the California desert and Plan Area. The environmental baseline includes more than 50 renewable energy projects within the Plan Area (Appendix O). The DRECP would allow permitting of up to approximately 20,000 MW of renewable energy projects. As shown in Appendix O, Table 2, larger renewable energy projects generating more than 200 MW have the greatest potential to generate social change within the communities serving them. This is due to the large workforce necessary to construct these larger renewable energy installations.

The majority of baseline projects are located within DRECP DFAs (see Appendix O, Table 2). Therefore, these baseline projects have likely already influenced residents' perception and social attitudes toward renewable energy project development within those communities. The influence of these baseline projects is included within the DRECP scoping comments. It should be noted that Appendix O does not include all small renewable projects within the DRECP. Therefore, public opinion of the projects included in Appendix O does not necessarily reflect what may occur. However, these projects and DRECP scoping comments represent the best available information regarding community attitudes toward renewable energy development within the Plan Area.

Community values and attitudes have helped shape key Renewable Energy Action Team (REAT) documents guiding renewable energy development, including the DRECP, the Best Management Practices and Guidance Manual for Desert Renewable Energy Projects, and public scoping within this EIR/EIS. The REAT encouraged public input on the proposed scope of environmental review for the DRECP, including comments and information on species that should be covered under the DRECP and the range of alternatives the REAT should analyze in the EIR/EIS. Multiple scoping meetings have been conducted throughout the state during preparation for the DRECP. Additionally, the REAT holds regular stakeholder meetings, which include public comments. This EIR/EIS addresses all public comments and input received to date that is contained within the DRECP EIR/EIS scoping report, see Appendix T.

### **III.23.4 Environmental Justice Conditions**

#### **III.23.4.1 Defining Environmental Justice Populations**

The CEQ Environmental Justice Guidance defines “minorities” as individuals who are members of the following population groups: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Black not of Hispanic origin, or Hispanic (CEQ 1997). The total minority population has been calculated by subtracting the white alone, not Hispanic or Latino, population from the total population. For this analysis, an environmental justice population is identified when the minority population of the potentially affected area is greater than 50% or the minority population percentage is meaningfully greater than the minority population in the general population or other appropriate unit of geographical analysis. For this analysis, any census tract with a minority population greater than 50% was identified as an environmental justice tract of concern.

The CEQ Environmental Justice Guidance defines “low-income populations” as populations with mean annual incomes below the annual statistical poverty level. For this analysis, low-income population was determined by utilizing the U.S. Census data for persons “below poverty level.” The CEQ and EPA guidance do not provide a discrete threshold for determining when a low-income population should be identified for environmental justice. For this analysis, an environmental justice population is identified when the percentage of low-income population of the potentially affected area is equal to or greater than the low-income population of the greater geography. Specifically, if the low-income percentage of a census tract was found equal to or greater than that of the county in which it is located, it has been identified for environmental justice analysis.

The methodology used by BLM in defining low-income populations of concern identifies tracts when the percent below poverty level of a study area is equal to or greater than the larger geographic area. However, established CEC methodology only identifies low-income

populations when the study area percentage below poverty is greater than that of the larger respective geographic area.

This analysis uses the more conservative BLM methodology. As discussed below and shown in Table R1.23-1 (in Appendix R1), the BLM methodology results in identification of two tracts (Census Tracts 101 in Imperial County and Census Tract 99.06 in San Bernardino County) as being low-income tracts of concern. These tracts would not be included using the CEC environmental justice analysis criteria.

### III.23.4.2 Plan Area Minority and Low-Income Populations

Table III.23-5 identifies the minority and low-income percentages of California and each county that the Plan includes. Because no county is located entirely within the Plan boundary, U.S. Census tracts that contain the Plan area were determined. From this tract data, the total population and minority and low-income percentages of the population within Plan boundary are shown. More detailed data is provided in Appendix R1.23, Table R1.23-1.

**Table III.23-5  
U.S. Census 2008-2012 ACS1  
Environmental Justice Demographics for California and Regional Study Areas**

Area	Total Population	Minority <sup>2</sup> Population (Percent of Total) <sup>1</sup>	Percent of Total Population Low-Income <sup>1,3</sup>
California	37,325,068	22,347,558 (59.9%)	15.3%
<i>DRECP Counties</i>			
Imperial County, CA	173,487	149,611 (86.2%)	23.0%
Inyo County, CA	18,474	6,727 (33.9%)	11.3%
Kern County, CA	839,153	515,581 (61.4%)	22.5%
Los Angeles County, CA	9,840,024	7,108,419 (72.2%)	17.1%
Riverside County, CA	2,192,982	1,325,402 (60.4%)	15.6%
San Bernardino County, CA	2,041,029	1,363,925 (66.8%)	17.6%
San Diego County, CA	3,100,500	1,597,865 (51.5%)	13.9%
<i>DRECP Plan Area Census Tracts</i>			
Plan Area Boundary	1,114,305	681,221 (61.1%)	19.6% (average)

<sup>1</sup> Because U.S. Census 2008-2012 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates come from a sample population, a certain level of variability is associated with the estimates. Supporting documentation on ACS data accuracy and statistical testing can be found on the ACS website in the Data and Documentation section available here: [http://www.census.gov/acs/www/data\\_documentation/documentation\\_main/](http://www.census.gov/acs/www/data_documentation/documentation_main/). For purposes of this analysis, U.S. Census ACS data was utilized for providing current data, consistency between the data used to identify minority and low-income populations, and consistency between the different geographies presented. For these reasons, U.S. Census ACS data is considered best available for representing the demographic makeup of Plan Area communities for this programmatic EIS/EIR. Use of

published U.S. Census ACS data estimates is commonly used by Lead Agencies in compliance with Executive Order 12898, California Government Code Section 65040.12 and Public Resources Code Section 72000, as well as CEQ and EPA guidance for incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns under NEPA and CEQA.

<sup>2</sup> Represents the population excluding those identified as “Not Hispanic or Latino, White Alone” within the US Census 2008-2012 ACS data set.

<sup>3</sup> Represents individuals with mean annual incomes below the annual statistical poverty level, identified by poverty status in the last 12 months, identified as “percent below poverty level” within the US Census 2008-2012 ACS data set.

**Source:** U.S. Census Bureau 2014a and 2014b, as queried through ArcGIS Online to determine Census tracts containing the Plan Area.

### III.23.4.3 Study Area Minority and Low-Income Populations

Appendix R1.23, Table R1.23-1, presents environmental justice demographic data for each census tract within the Plan Area, by county. When considering environmental justice population on a programmatic level, the defined study area includes minority and low-income populations of U.S. Census tracts contained within the Plan Area boundary. Table R1.23-1 presents the population of each U.S. Census tract (by county) contained within the Plan Area boundary and the percentage of minority or low-income population within.

As described above in Section III.23.4.1, within Table R1.23-1, a minority census tract of concern was identified when the minority population of the census tract was found to be greater than 50%. Low-income populations of concern are identified when the percentage of low-income population of the census tract is equal to or greater than the percent low-income of the county in which it is located.

In Table R1.23-1, tracts of concern have been shaded, with their locations shown in Appendix R1, Figures R1.23-1 and R1.23-2. As shown in Table R1.23-1, the following summarizes the number of identified environmental justice tracts of concern by county:

- **Imperial County:** Contains 25 minority tracts of concern and 13 low-income tracts of concern.
- **Inyo County:** Contains no minority tracts of concern and no low-income tracts of concern.
- **Kern County:** Contains 4 minority tracts of concern and 7 low-income tracts of concern.
- **Los Angeles County:** Contains 58 minority tracts of concern and 42 low-income tracts of concern.
- **Riverside County:** Contains 8 minority tracts of concern and 7 low-income tracts of concern.
- **San Bernardino County:** Contains 41 minority tracts of concern and 49 low-income tracts of concern.
- **San Diego County:** Contains no minority tracts of concern and 2 low-income tracts of concern.

### **III.23.5 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice by Ecoregion Subarea**

This section identifies a brief overview for communities of interest by ecoregion subareas for socioeconomics and environmental justice. Also refer to these tables for details on each ecoregion subarea: For countywide and local study area populations and housing data, see Tables III.23-1 and III.23-2. For employment profile and local government economic profile data for the counties within each ecoregion subarea, see Tables III.23-3 and III.23-4. For environmental justice demographic data for the Census tracts containing each ecoregion subarea, see Table R1.23-1 (and corresponding Figures R1.23-1 and R1.23-2) in Appendix R1.23.

#### **III.23.5.1 Cadiz Valley and Chocolate Mountains Ecoregion Subarea**

The majority of the Cadiz Valley and Chocolate Mountains ecoregion subarea is within Eastern Riverside County. The northern portion of this ecoregion subarea is within San Bernardino County, and the southern portion is within Eastern Imperial County. Blythe, in Riverside County, is the only local study area community that is entirely within the Cadiz Valley and Chocolate Mountains ecoregion subarea. No local study area communities within San Bernardino or Imperial counties are located within this ecoregion subarea.

#### **III.23.5.2 Imperial Borrego Valley Ecoregion Subarea**

The majority of the Imperial Borrego Valley ecoregion subarea is within Imperial County, and a small portion of its western boundary is within San Diego County. The following Imperial County local study area communities are entirely within this ecoregion subarea:

- Brawley
- Calexico
- El Centro
- Imperial

No local study area communities within San Diego County are located within the Imperial Borrego Valley ecoregion subarea.

#### **III.23.5.3 Kingston and Funeral Mountains Ecoregion Subarea**

The northern portion of the Kingston and Funeral Mountains ecoregion subarea is within Inyo County, and the southern portion is within San Bernardino County. No local study areas are located within this ecoregion subarea.

#### **III.23.5.4 Mojave and Silurian Valley Ecoregion Subarea**

The Mojave and Silurian Valley ecoregion subarea is almost entirely within San Bernardino County, except for a small portion of its western boundary within Kern County. No local study areas are located here.

#### **III.23.5.5 Owens River Valley Ecoregion Subarea**

The Owens River Valley ecoregion subarea is entirely within the western side of Inyo County. Local study areas within this subarea are smaller rural communities. The portion of the Owens River Valley ecoregion subarea within the BLM Bishop Field Office boundary is economically important; its local economy is geared to tourism and the film industry. The BLM Bishop Field Office issues dozens of annual permits for commercial still and motion photography, ranging from advertisements to major motion pictures in the Alabama Hills. Revenue from these permits and localized spending from production crews and materials help shape the socioeconomic profile of this particular portion of the ecoregion subarea. Please note tourism and filming is important to all of Inyo County and not just the Alabama Hills. The ability to use public lands in the county in the way they have been for generations is also an important factor in the socioeconomic profile of Inyo County.

#### **III.23.5.6 Panamint Death Valley Ecoregion Subarea**

The northern portion of the Panamint Death Valley ecoregion subarea is within Inyo County, and the southern portion is within San Bernardino County. A small portion of the southwestern boundary is within Kern County. Local study areas within this subarea are smaller rural communities.

#### **III.23.5.7 Pinto Lucerne Valley and Eastern Slopes Ecoregion Subarea**

The majority of the Pinto Lucerne Valley and Eastern Slopes ecoregion subarea is within San Bernardino County, with a portion of the south end within Riverside County. The following San Bernardino County local study area communities are located entirely within this ecoregion subarea:

- Apple Valley
- Twentynine Palms
- Yucca Valley

No local study area communities within Riverside County are located within the Pinto Lucerne Valley and Eastern Slopes ecoregion subarea.

### **III.23.5.8 Piute Valley and Sacramento Mountains Ecoregion Subarea**

The Piute Valley and Sacramento Mountains ecoregion subarea is entirely within the southeastern area of San Bernardino County. Local study areas within this subarea are smaller rural communities.

### **III.23.5.9 Providence and Bullion Mountains Ecoregion Subarea**

The Providence and Bullion mountains ecoregion subarea is entirely within San Bernardino County. Local study areas within this subarea are smaller rural communities.

### **III.23.5.10 West Mojave and Eastern Slopes Ecoregion Subarea**

The West Mojave and Eastern Slopes ecoregion subarea is within Kern, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino counties, with a small portion located in Inyo County. This ecoregion subarea is the most urban of all the DRECP ecoregion subareas and it contains the following local study area communities:

- Kern County
- California City
- Ridgecrest
- Tehachapi
- Los Angeles County
- Lancaster
- Palmdale
- San Bernardino County
- Adelanto
- Barstow
- Hesperia
- Victorville

## **III.23.6 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice—Bureau of Land Management Land Use Plan Amendment Affected Environment**

As described in Volume I, Section I.0.3.3.2, DRECP Permit Areas, BLM Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA) lands are located throughout the Plan Area in Imperial, Inyo, Kern, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, and San Diego counties. Existing socioeconomic and demographic conditions for these counties and the cities proximate to BLM LUPA lands are presented on a programmatic basis in other sections within this chapter (Sections III.23.2, III.23.3, and III.23.4).

### **III.23.7 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice—Natural Community Conservation Plan Environmental Setting**

The affected environment for the NCCP is the same as that described for the entire Plan Area. While there are Department of Defense (DOD) and tribal lands within the Plan Area, the Plan does not analyze effects on these lands so they are not included in the description of the affected environment.

### **III.23.8 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice—General Conservation Plan Affected Environment**

The affected environment for the General Conservation Plan (GCP) includes a subset of the lands covered by Plan-wide analysis and the NCCP. In addition to excluding DOD and tribal lands, the GCP lands exclude all other federal lands (e.g., BLM-administered public lands, national parks). GCP lands are located throughout the Plan Area in Imperial, Inyo, Kern, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, and San Diego counties. Existing conditions for these regional and local study areas are presented on a programmatic basis elsewhere in this chapter (Sections III.23.2, III.23.3, and III.23.4).

### **III.23.9 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice Outside of Plan Area**

#### **III.23.9.1 Transmission**

Because of the regional nature of socioeconomics and environmental justice issues, the environmental settings presented for the regulatory setting (Section III.23.11), the employment environmental setting (Section III.23.2.4), the public finance environmental setting (Section III.23.2.5), and the community and social organization environmental setting (Section III.23.3) also apply to transmission corridors in the Outside of Plan Areas.

The following describes the population, housing, and environmental justice for each of the "Out of Plan Area" areas: San Diego, Los Angeles, North Palm Springs-Riverside, and Central Valley. Consistent with the socioeconomics and environmental justice environmental setting presented for the Plan Area, the following data include only the counties traversed by corridors and the largest city within each county Outside of the Plan Area.

Table III.23-6 summarizes the current and forecasted population of the Out of Plan Area corridors. Table III.23-7 summarizes the existing housing profile and availability in each Out of Plan Area. Finally, Table III.23-8 identifies the minority and low-income percentage of the population for each Out of Plan Area.

### **III.23.9.2 San Diego Area**

The San Diego corridor outside the DRECP boundary roughly follows the existing Sunrise Powerlink corridor. The line would exit the Plan Area in the Jacumba area, head northwest through the McCain Valley, head southwest then south through the Cleveland National Forest, then head west then northwest through Alpine and the urban and suburban areas of Santee, El Cajon, and San Diego.

### **III.23.9.3 Los Angeles Area**

Corridors in this area follow the 500 kV Segment 11 of the Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project (TRTP) for approximately 37 miles from the Vincent Substation to the Mesa Substation, and an existing 220 kV line south from the Mesa Substation near the city of Montebello to Lighthipe Substation near the city of Paramount for about 12 miles. One upgraded 320 kV DC line would extend from Station 7 to Station B/Station 8 located near the city of South Gate in the Los Angeles area. No socioeconomic or environmental justice data are presented for the portion of the Los Angeles area corridors traversing Angeles National Forest, as these areas have very little population and federal and state demographic data for these lands are not available.

### **III.23.9.4 North Palm Springs-Riverside Area**

Corridors in the North Palm Springs-Riverside area include multiple 500 kV transmission lines, which primarily follow the existing Devers transmission corridor. This corridor is located within both Riverside and San Bernardino counties.

### **III.23.9.5 Central Valley Area**

In the Central Valley area, a 500 kV transmission line would extend from the Whirlwind Substation to the PG&E Midway 500 kV Substation near Buttonwillow, and two 500 kV lines would extend from the PG&E Midway Substation to the Tesla Substation west of the city of Tracy; the latter would follow the Path 15 Transmission Line corridor through Gates and Los Banos. The route is generally 3 to 7 miles west of Interstate 5 from the PG&E Midway Substation near Buttonwillow to the Tesla Substation. This corridor is located primarily within unincorporated areas of Kern, Kings, Fresno, Stanislaus, and San Joaquin counties.

**Table III.23-6  
Population Profile and Projections for the Transmission Out of Plan Areas**

Area	2013 Population	2020 Projected Population	2030 Projected Population	2040 Projected Population
<i>San Diego Area</i>				
<i>San Diego County</i>	3,150,178	3,333,995	3,530,896	3,749,240
San Diego	1,326,238	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Los Angeles Area</i>				
<i>Los Angeles County</i>	9,958,091	10,441,441	10,950,335	11,243,022
Los Angeles	3,863,839	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>North Palm Springs–Riverside Area</i>				
<i>Riverside County</i>	2,555,059	2,593,211	3,046,064	3,462,256
Riverside	311,955	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>San Bernardino County</i>	2,076,274	2,273,017	2,626,945	2,988,648
San Bernardino	212,639	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Central Valley Area</i>				
<i>Kern County</i>	857,882	1,057,440	1,341,278	1,618,681
Bakersfield	359,221	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Kings County</i>	152,007	176,647	205,627	235,129
Hanford	55,479	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Fresno County</i>	952,166	1,071,728	1,241,773	1,397,138
Fresno	508,453	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Stanislaus County</i>	542,124	589,156	674,859	759,027
Modesto	205,987	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>San Joaquin County</i>	698,414	810,845	1,004,147	1,213,708
Stockton	296,344	N/A	N/A	N/A

N/A = Data unavailable.

Source: California Department of Finance 2013a and 2013b

**Table III.23-7  
Year 2013 Housing Profile of the Transmission Out of Plan Areas**

Area	Total Housing Units	Vacant Units (Vacancy Rate %)
<i>San Diego Area</i>		
<i>San Diego County</i>	1,174,866	77,541 (6.6%)
San Diego	519,181	33,228 (6.4%)
<i>Los Angeles Area</i>		
<i>Los Angeles County</i>	3,463,382	204,339 (5.9%)
Los Angeles	1,425,372	96,925 (6.8%)

**Table III.23-7  
Year 2013 Housing Profile of the Transmission Out of Plan Areas**

Area	Total Housing Units	Vacant Units (Vacancy Rate %)
<i>North Palm Springs-Riverside Area</i>		
<i>Riverside County</i>	<i>812,234</i>	<i>116,149 (14.3%)</i>
Riverside	99,152	6,544 (6.6%)
<i>San Bernardino County</i>	<i>704,540</i>	<i>88,068 (12.5%)</i>
San Bernardino	65,451	6,152 (9.4%)
<i>Central Valley Area</i>		
<i>Kern County, CA</i>	<i>288,624</i>	<i>30,017 (10.4%)</i>
Bakersfield	123,066	9,722 (7.9%)
<i>Kings County</i>	<i>44,429</i>	<i>2,710 (6.1%)</i>
Hanford	18,783	1,014 (5.4%)
<i>Fresno County</i>	<i>320,643</i>	<i>26,613 (8.3%)</i>
Fresno	174,775	13,282 (7.6%)
<i>Stanislaus County</i>	<i>179,908</i>	<i>14,393 (8.0%)</i>
Modesto	75,601	5,973 (7.9%)
<i>San Joaquin County</i>	<i>253,906</i>	<i>20,312 (8.0%)</i>
Stockton	100,003	9,100 (9.1%)

N/A = Data unavailable.

Source: California Department of Finance 2013b

**Table III.23-8  
U.S. Census 2008-2012 ACS1  
Environmental Justice Demographics of the Transmission Out of Plan Areas**

Area	Total Population <sup>1</sup>	Minority Population (%) <sup>2</sup>	Percent Below Poverty (Low-Income) <sup>3</sup>
<i>San Diego Area</i>			
<i>San Diego County, CA</i>	<i>3,100,500</i>	<i>1,597,865 (51.5%)</i>	<i>13.9%</i>
San Diego	1,308,619	723,423 (55.3%)	15.5%
<i>Los Angeles Area</i>			
<i>Los Angeles County, CA</i>	<i>9,840,024</i>	<i>7,108,419 (72.2%)</i>	<i>17.1%</i>
Los Angeles	3,804,503	2,713,987 (71.3%)	21.2%
<i>North Palm Springs-Riverside Area</i>			
<i>Riverside County, CA</i>	<i>2,192,982</i>	<i>1,325,402 (60.4%)</i>	<i>15.6%</i>
Riverside	306,128	204,209 (66.7%)	17.5%
<i>San Bernardino County, CA</i>	<i>2,041,029</i>	<i>1,363,925 (66.8%)</i>	<i>17.6%</i>
San Bernardino	210,624	169,486 (80.4%)	30.6%

**Table III.23-8**  
**U.S. Census 2008-2012 ACS1**  
**Environmental Justice Demographics of the Transmission Out of Plan Areas**

Area	Total Population <sup>1</sup>	Minority Population (%) <sup>2</sup>	Percent Below Poverty (Low-Income) <sup>3</sup>
<i>Central Valley Area</i>			
<i>Kern County, CA</i>	<i>839,153</i>	<i>515,581 (61.4%)</i>	<i>22.5%</i>
Bakersfield	347,091	217,201 (62.6%)	19.3%
<i>Kings County</i>	<i>151,989</i>	<i>98,092 (64.5%)</i>	<i>20.7%</i>
Hanford	53,695	30,844 (57.4%)	18.3%
<i>Fresno County</i>	<i>930,517</i>	<i>626,601 (67.3%)</i>	<i>24.8%</i>
Fresno	495,777	345,488 (69.7%)	27.5%
<i>Stanislaus County</i>	<i>515,115</i>	<i>274,570 (53.3%)</i>	<i>19.2%</i>
Modesto	201,986	104,338 (51.7%)	19.5%
<i>San Joaquin County</i>	<i>687,036</i>	<i>440,185 (64.1%)</i>	<i>17.5%</i>
Stockton	292,692	224,975 (76.9%)	23.3%

<sup>1</sup> Because U.S. Census 2008-2012 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates come from a sample population, a certain level of variability is associated with the estimates. Due to the size of the Plan Area, ACS estimate data was utilized for providing current data, consistency among the different geography types presented, and is considered to represent the best available for representing the demographic makeup of these communities for this programmatic EIR/EIS. Please note, US Census 5-year ACS data is regularly used by Lead Agencies for decisions under NEPA and CEQA.

<sup>2</sup> Represents the population excluding those “Not Hispanic or Latino, White Alone.”

<sup>3</sup> Represents individuals with mean annual incomes below the annual statistical poverty level, identified by poverty status in the last 12 months, as identified within the US Census 2008-2012 ACS data set as “percent below poverty level.”

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2014a, 2014b

### **III.23.10 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice—Bureau of Land Management Land Use Plan Amendment Outside of Plan Area**

As shown in Figure I.0-2b, BLM-administered lands are located Outside the Plan Area within Inyo, Riverside, and San Diego counties, and these lands would be covered by the amendment to the CDCA Plan. Socioeconomics and environmental justice environmental setting data for Inyo, Riverside, and San Diego counties are presented in the Plan-wide analysis sections above.