4.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING/PUBLIC SERVICES/UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

This Section provides a discussion of existing population and housing, public services, and utilities and an analysis of potential impacts that may result from Project implementation.

4.12.1 Environmental Setting

The proposed pipeline would extend through unincorporated areas of Yolo, Sutter, Sacramento, and Placer counties. The majority of the pipeline’s route would pass through rural agricultural lands that include structures and homes associated with agricultural land use. The Project area includes a temporary right-of-way (ROW) on either side of the proposed alignment, and any potential impacts from the Project would occur outside of the ROW in the Project vicinity.

Population and Housing

The proposed Project consists of a 40 mile-long pipeline that would cross California’s Central Valley in unincorporated areas of Yolo, Sutter, Sacramento, and Placer counties. A majority of the Project, approximately 27 of the 40 miles of the route, lies in eastern Yolo County. Continuing eastward, the pipeline would traverse a portion of southernmost Sutter County and southwest Placer County. The eastern terminal of the pipeline is located outside the City of Roseville’s boundaries, but within the sphere of influence. Additionally, the Powerline Road Distribution Feeder Main (DFM) would extend approximately 2.5 miles south, from the Sutter County portion of the pipeline, into Sacramento County. Future residential and commercial developments are planned in the Project vicinity within Placer, Sutter and Sacramento counties.

Population

Yolo County

Yolo County has a land area of 1,013.27 square miles with a population density of 166.5 persons per square mile (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). As of 2005, approximately 12 percent of the population lived in unincorporated areas of the county. Between 1990 and 2000, the county's population increased from 141,210 to 168,660, or 0.9 percent per year. Between 2000 and 2006, the population increased to 188,085 (U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts), or 1.9 percent per year. The California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates Yolo County to have a population
of 193,983 as of January 1, 2007, and population growth within the county is expected to continue, reaching 245,052 by 2020 and 327,982 by 2050, growing annually by 2 percent, and 1.1 percent, respectively.

Sutter County

Sutter County has a land area of 602.54 square miles with a population density of 130.9 persons per square mile (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). As of 2005, approximately 26 percent of the population lived in unincorporated areas of the county. Between 1990 and 2000, the county’s population increased from 64,415 to 78,930, or 2.2 percent per year. Between 2000 and 2006, the population grew to 91,410 (U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts). The DOF estimates Sutter County’s population at 93,919 as of January 1, 2007, and population growth is expected to continue, reaching 141,159 by 2020 and 282,894 by 2050.

Sacramento County

Sacramento County has a land area of 965.65 square miles with a population density of 1,266.6 persons per square mile (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). As of 2005, approximately 34 percent of the population lived in unincorporated areas of the county. Between the years of 1990 and 2000, the population increased from 1,041,219 to 1,223,499. Between 2000 and 2006, the population increased to 1,374,724 (U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts). Sacramento County has the highest population (at 1,387,771 as of January 1, 2007 as estimated by the DOF) relative to the other counties through which the proposed pipeline would be constructed.

Placer County

Placer County has a land area of 1,404.37 square miles with a population density of 179.9 persons per square mile (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). As of 2005, approximately 34 percent lived in unincorporated areas of the county. Between the years of 1990 and 2000, the population increased from 172,796 to 248,399. Between 2000 and 2006, the population grew to 326,242 (U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts). The population of Placer County, as of January 1, 2007, was estimated by the DOF as 324,495 and is expected to grow to 428,535 by 2020 and 751,208 by 2050.

Table 4.12-1 shows population projections by county.
## Table 4.12-1: Population Projections by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2050</th>
<th>2000 to 2010</th>
<th>2010 to 2020</th>
<th>2020 to 2030</th>
<th>2030 to 2040</th>
<th>2040 to 2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County</td>
<td>170,190</td>
<td>206,100</td>
<td>245,052</td>
<td>275,360</td>
<td>301,934</td>
<td>327,982</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County</td>
<td>79,632</td>
<td>102,326</td>
<td>141,159</td>
<td>182,401</td>
<td>229,620</td>
<td>282,894</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td>1,233,575</td>
<td>1,451,866</td>
<td>1,622,306</td>
<td>1,803,872</td>
<td>1,989,221</td>
<td>2,176,508</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>252,223</td>
<td>347,543</td>
<td>428,535</td>
<td>512,509</td>
<td>625,964</td>
<td>751,208</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Finance 2004.

## Table 4.12-2: Projected Area Housing Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2000 Census</th>
<th>2005 Estimate</th>
<th>Percentage Increase 2000 to 2005</th>
<th>Projections 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County</td>
<td>168,660</td>
<td>184,932</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>263,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County</td>
<td>78,930</td>
<td>88,876</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>125,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td>1,223,499</td>
<td>1,363,482</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>1,933,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>248,399</td>
<td>317,028</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>585,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing

The availability of permanent and temporary housing varies along the proposed pipeline route. Within close proximity of the Project area, Woodland in Yolo County, Sacramento, Rio Linda and North Highlands in Sacramento County, and Roseville in Placer County are likely to have adequate hotel/motel space to accommodate temporary construction workers. Housing availability and types are provided in Table 4.12-2.

Yolo County

Yolo County has approximately 71,755 housing units with a 3.53 percent vacancy rate (DOF 2007). Approximately 57.69 percent of the units consist of single-family, detached housing. Multiple-family structures with five or more units account for approximately 23.53 percent of all housing, more than any other county within the Project area. Approximately 1,200 hotel rooms are available with high vacancy rates (PG&E 2007).

Sutter County

Sutter County has approximately 33,069 housing units with a 4.49 percent vacancy rate (DOF 2007). Approximately 73.42 percent of the units consist of single-family detached housing while multiple-family structures with five or more units account for approximately 11.97 percent. Approximately 958 hotel rooms are available with fairly high vacancy rates (PG&E 2007).

Sacramento County

Sacramento County has approximately 545,287 housing units with a 4.35 percent vacancy rate (DOF 2007). Approximately 64.33 percent of the units consist of single-family detached housing while multiple family structures with five or more units account for approximately 19.74 percent. Sacramento County has the highest amount of available hotel rooms at more than 10,000 but vacancy reduces availability to 1,500 rooms on peak nights. However, this reduced amount is still in excess of the total number of available hotel rooms located within the other three counties (PG&E 2007).

Placer County

Placer County has approximately 144,207 housing units with a 10.82 percent vacancy rate (DOF 2007). Approximately 77.99 percent, the highest out of the four counties, consist of single-family detached housing while multiple family structures
with five or more units account for approximately 11.46 percent. Approximately 494 hotel rooms are available with high vacancy rates (PG&E 2007).

**Public Services**

Public services within the Project area include fire protection, police protection, public schools, hospitals, and convalescent homes. Below is a discussion of the existing public services within the Project area.

*Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services*

**Yolo County**

Yolo County has 19 fire districts. The proposed Project lies within five of those districts: Elkhorn, Knights Landing, Yolo, Madison, and Esparto. Each district has one fire station. The Elkhorn Fire Department is located at 19396 County Road (CR) 124 in West Sacramento. The Knights Landing Fire Department is located at 42115 Sixth Street in Knights Landing. The Yolo Fire Protection District’s headquarters are located at 37720 Sacramento Street in Yolo. The Madison Fire Department is located at 17880 Stephens Street in Madison. The Esparto Fire Protection District is headquartered at 16960 Yolo Avenue in Esparto. Each station is located within approximately 3 to 5 miles of the Project area, with the exception of the Yolo Fire Station, which is approximately 0.5 mile from the Project area, near the Interstate 5 (I-5) crossing. The majority of the personnel in each district are volunteers whose numbers fluctuate depending on the season.

**Sutter County**

Sutter County has six fire service districts. Of the six fire districts, the Sutter Basin Fire Protection District and County Service Area D are located within the Project area. The fire stations that are charged with responding to emergencies within the Project area are the Pleasant Grove Fire Department, located at 3100 Howsley Road in Pleasant Grove and the Robins-Sutter Basin Fire Department, located at 2340 California Street in Sutter. The Pleasant Grove Fire Department is staffed by volunteers on an on-call basis. The Robins-Sutter Basin Fire Department is staffed with three unit personnel, one engineer, one station captain, and approximately 12 volunteers. These two Fire Departments are approximately 5 and 10 miles away from the pipeline, respectively. All Sutter County fire districts are able to provide medical aid at the basic life support level with the ability to perform emergency cardiac shock (defibrillation). County Service Area F has a Hazardous Materials Response Team, which includes equipment and personnel trained to mitigate
hazardous materials releases. Although not stationed in the immediate Project area, this team would respond to any hazardous material incident in the Project area.

Sacramento County

Sacramento County’s northwestern boundary lies approximately 1.25 miles to the south of the proposed Line 407 East. The proposed Powerline Road DFM extends south from the junction of Line 407 East and Line 407 West approximately 2 miles into the northwestern corner of Sacramento County. The Sacramento Fire Department, comprising 25 stations, serves this area. The DFM is approximately 4.5 miles from the Natomas Fire District’s Station Number 3, located at 7280 West Elkhorn Boulevard. Station Number 3 is responsible for first response in the Powerline Road DFM Project area and is generally staffed by three to four personnel members at any given time (Melton 2008).

Placer County

Approximately 6.25 miles of Line 407 East extends into the southwestern portion of Placer County. This area is part of the Dry Creek Fire Service area and is served by the Placer County Fire Department. The Cook Riolo Station, which is the nearest to the Project area, is located approximately 1 mile to the east. This station has two fire captains, one full-time firefighter-engineer, one part-time firefighter-engineer, 2.33 full-time firefighters, and one part-time firefighter (Brooks 2008).

Police Protection

Yolo County

The unincorporated areas of Yolo County are served by the Yolo County Sheriff’s Department which is divided into three major divisions: Administrative and Support Services, Detention Services, and Field Operations. The Department has 276 employees of which 95 are sworn personnel (Yolo County Sheriff’s Department 2008). The closest station is located approximately 6 miles south of the Line 407 West Project area, within the City of Woodland at 2500 East Gibson Road.

Sutter County

The unincorporated areas of Sutter County are served by the Sutter County Sheriff’s Department consisting of 57 sworn personnel. The department is headquartered at 1077 Civic Center Boulevard in Yuba City, approximately 30 miles north of the Project site. Two additional substations are located in Live Oak and Sutter and are 29.5 and 37 miles from the Project, respectively.
Sacramento County

The unincorporated areas of Sacramento County are served by the Sacramento County Sheriff Department. The department headquarters are located at 711 G Street in downtown Sacramento. Of the 11 substations in the county, the nearest substation to the Powerline Road DFM is the Northwest Service Center located at 7511 Watt Avenue, approximately 11 miles east of the Project area. The Northwest Division has 76 sworn officers and is broken down into five zones, with zone 1 covering the Project area. In addition, the Sacramento International Airport has Sheriffs on patrol 24 hours a day and is located directly south of the DFM.

Placer County

The unincorporated areas of Placer County are served by the Placer County Sheriff’s Department. The Department is headquartered in the City of Auburn at 2929 Richardson Drive with two additional substations and service centers located throughout the county. The South Placer Substation in Loomis is responsible for servicing the eastern most extent of the Project area and is located at 6140 Horseshoe Bar Road, approximately 12 miles northeast of the Project site. The Substation is staffed by approximately 50 personal including 33 patrol positions. The West Roseville/Dry creek area, which covers the Project area, has a patrol officer on duty 24 hours a day.

California Highway Patrol

Yolo, Sutter, Sacramento, and Placer counties are served by the California Highway Patrol’s Valley Division. The Valley Division has 16 area offices, and 785 uniformed officers. The CHP’s Valley Division oversees all State and county roads within the Project area. The Area Office closest to the Project area is located in Woodland at 1975 Wintun Drive, approximately 4.5 miles south of the proposed alignment.

Schools

The following information regarding schools in the Project areas is provided by the district and school websites as well as data compiled by the California Department of Education as found on the Ed-Data website. Distance from the proposed alignment to schools in the project vicinity are provided below. These distance are not provided to respond to specific significance criteria in this Section, but are provided for general reference for schools along the proposed alignment.
Yolo County

Yolo County has five school districts and one countywide special education program. Of the county’s five school districts, two serve the Project area and are described here. The Esparto Unified School District operates one elementary, one junior high and two high schools. Approximately 1,036 students are enrolled in the district. The Woodland Joint Unified School District operates 12 elementary, two junior high, and three high schools. In addition, two community day schools are overseen by the district. In total, approximately 10,690 students are served by this district. Within the town of Yolo, there are several schools within 0.5 mile of the pipeline route. The closest is an existing school with elementary through high school grades to the south of the Line 407 alignment. The existing Cache Creek High School is at the intersection of Clay Street and 2nd Street and is approximately 0.77 mile south of the pipeline alignment and 0.8 mile southeast of the proposed Yolo Junction Pressure Limiting Station along Line 172A.

Sutter County

Sutter County is served by 10 elementary school districts and 4 high school districts. The Marcum-Illinois Union and Pleasant Grove Elementary Districts, along with the East Nicolaus Joint Union High School District, serve the Project area. Both elementary districts consist of one school each and combined serve approximately 1,111 K-8 students. The East Nicolaus District consists of one high school and one continuation school, which combined serve approximately 332 students. No schools are located within 0.5 mile of the Project area in Sutter County.

Sacramento County

Sacramento County is served by 16 public school districts, one of which, Natomas Unified School District, serves the Project area. The district consists of eight elementary schools, two middle schools, three high schools, three charter schools and one continuation school. Combined, these schools serve approximately 10,821 students. There are no schools within 0.5 mile of the Project area in Sacramento County.

Placer County

Placer County is served by 17 primary and secondary education school districts, of which, two serve the Project area. The Dry Creek Elementary School District is comprised of six elementary schools and two middle schools that combined serve approximately 7,377 students. The Roseville Joint Union High School District
consists of six high schools, enrolling approximately 8,918 students. In Placer County there are two schools within 0.5 mile of the proposed Project; the Alpha School (historical) is approximately 0.5 mile north of Line 407 along Baseline Road, and the Coyote Ridge Elementary School is approximately 0.4 mile north-northeast of the eastern terminus of Line 407 at the intersection of Baseline Road and Fair Oaks Boulevard.

**Hospitals and Convalescent Homes**

The two closest emergency medical facilities to the Project area are Woodland Memorial Hospital in Woodland, approximately 5.5 miles from the west end of Line 407 West, and Sutter Roseville Medical Center in Roseville, approximately 5.8 miles from the east end of Line 407 East. Both Woodland and Roseville have several other healthcare facilities, including hospitals and convalescent homes, located within their city boundaries. No hospitals, convalescent homes, or medical centers are within 0.5 mile of the Project area.

**Parks and Recreation**

The majority of the land through which the Project traverses is privately owned and is used for agricultural purposes. The proposed pipeline would travel through the Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area, Sacramento River Ranch Conservation Bank, and the Huffman East, Huffman West, Vestal and Atkinson Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation tracts, as well as under the Sacramento River. Both the Sacramento River and Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area offer recreational opportunities including, but not limited to, hiking, fishing, birding, and boating. See Section 4.11, Recreation, for more information.

**Utilities**

Public utilities services within the Project area include electricity and natural gas, water and wastewater, solid waste and recycling and telephone, internet and cable television. Below is a discussion of the existing public services within the Project area.

**Electricity and Natural gas**

PG&E provides electric power and natural gas to Yolo, Sutter and most of Placer counties. Sacramento County, as well as a small portion of Placer County, is provided with electricity by the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD). Within Placer County, the City of Roseville receives electricity from Roseville Electric, which
serves approximately 41,883 residential and 5,410 commercial customers within the
city limits.

**Service Systems**

*Water and Wastewater*

**Yolo County**

Yolo County is served by several water districts, including the Yolo County Flood
Control and Water Conservation District (YFCWC), North Delta Water Agency,
Yolo-Zamora Water District, Dunnigan Water District, and various smaller
reclamation districts. A majority of the Project area in Yolo County falls within the
YFCWC service area, which covers 195,000 acres of Yolo County, including the
cities of Woodland, Davis, and Winters, and the towns of Capay, Esparto, Madison,
and other small communities within the Capay Valley.

The YFCWC manages more than 150 miles of canals and laterals, three dams,
two reservoirs, and a small hydroelectric plant. The YFCWC’s water supply
includes surface water from Clear Lake, Indian Valley, and Cache Creek, and
groundwater recharged by the YFCWC’s operations. Residences in
unincorporated areas of the county, including the Project area, may also use private
wells as their primary source of water. Sewer services are not provided in the
Project area in Yolo County and sewage disposal is limited to individual septic
systems.

**Sutter County**

Sutter County’s Environmental Health Services, under the Community Services
Department, is responsible for water and wastewater including onsite sewage
disposal, water wells and well monitoring (Sutter County 1996).

Much of the unincorporated areas of Sutter County utilize private wells and septic
tanks for their water and sewage needs. The Town of Robbins, in the southwestern
area of the county, is the only town that has its own water district (PG&E 2007).

**Sacramento County**

Within Sacramento County, there are 28 water purveyors responsible for treating
and distributing surface and groundwater as well as securing surface water rights
(Sacramento County General Plan). The Sacramento County Department of Water
Resources (SCDWR), within Sacramento County’s Municipal Services Agency,
manages surface water and groundwater resources via the Sacramento County Water Agency (SCWA). The SCWA is responsible for providing water to all areas not served by one of the purveyors. The SCDWR provides services such as drainage, flood control, and water supply to various areas in unincorporated Sacramento County. In addition to the SCDWR, more than 20 public and private water districts provide water supply service in unincorporated areas of Sacramento County. The Natomas Central Mutual Water Company is the primary irrigation water supplier within the Powerline Road DFM Project area.

The Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) and County Sanitation District 1 (CSD-1) provide sanitary sewer and wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment services within the developed areas of Sacramento County. Wastewater from unincorporated areas of Sacramento County is conveyed to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant in Elk Grove, which is owned and operated by the SRCSD. In addition, the SRCSD provides treatment services for a small number of residential customers in Roseville and south Placer County. CSD-1 also serves unincorporated areas of Sacramento County.

Placer County

The Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) encompasses the entire, 1,500-square-mile boundary of Placer County and carries out a broad range of responsibility including, but not limited to, water resource planning and management, retail and wholesale supply of irrigation water and drinking water and production of hydroelectric energy (Placer County General Plan 1994). The PCWA operates an extensive raw water distribution system that includes 165 miles of canals, ditches, flumes, and several small reservoirs. Drinking water is produced through a network of eight water treatment plants. A significant amount of PCWA raw water irrigates agricultural land and golf courses. Placer County provides sewer services to incorporated areas of the County, as well as some areas just outside of city limits. Private septic systems are used in the Project area, which lies in unincorporated Placer County.

Solid Waste and Recycling Service

Solid waste and recycling services for the Project area are discussed below. A summary of landfill capacity is provided in Table 4.12-3.
Waste Management, Inc. is a private company that is contracted with Yolo County and a majority of the cities within Yolo County to provide garbage and recycling collection and disposal services. There are two landfills in the county: the Yolo County Central Landfill, and the University of California, Davis Landfill, which serves the University. A transfer station is located in Esparto. The Yolo County Central Landfill is located northeast of Davis at CR 28H and CR 104 on 724 acres of which 473 acres are used for waste disposal. This landfill is permitted to accept 1,800 tons of solid waste per day and has an estimated remaining capacity of 16,122,000 cubic yards or 64 percent (CIWMB 2008).

Yuba-Sutter Disposal, Inc., a subsidiary of Norcal Waste Systems, Inc., provides recycling and solid waste collection services to residential and commercial customers in Live Oak, Marysville, Wheatland, Knights Landing, Yuba City, Beale Air Force Base, and the counties of Yuba and Sutter. Additionally, the company operates two transfer stations, a materials recovery facility, one household hazardous waste collection facility, one buy-back center, and a composting facility. (Yuba-Sutter Disposal, Inc. 2008). Yuba-Sutter Disposal, Inc. serves more than 30,000 residential customers and 5,000 commercial customers, and collects more than 100,000 tons of materials annually within their service area.

Solid waste collected by Yuba-Sutter Disposal, Inc. is brought to Norcal Waste Systems’ Ostrom Road Landfill, Inc., located in Yuba County at 5900 Ostrom Road in Wheatland. The Ostrom Road Landfill provides solid waste disposal services to municipal and commercial customers in the northern Sacramento Valley including Sutter County. The site comprises 261 acres, 225 of which are permitted as a Class II Landfill (Norcal Waste Systems Ostrom Road Land Fill, Inc.). This landfill is permitted to accept 3,000 tons of solid waste per day and has an estimated remaining capacity of 40,600,000 cubic yards or 97 percent (CIWMB 2008).

Sacramento County’s Department of Waste Management & Recycling provides waste management for residents and businesses in the northern unincorporated areas of the county. Residents living in the unincorporated areas of the county south of Calvine Road receive waste management and recycling services provided by Central Valley Waste Services, a private waste-hauling firm under contract with
Sacramento County. The Sacramento County Landfill (also referred to as the Kiefer Landfill) is the primary municipal solid waste disposal facility in Sacramento County, and is the only landfill facility in Sacramento County permitted to accept household waste from the public. Kiefer Landfill is located at 12701 Kiefer Boulevard in Slough house. This landfill is permitted to accept 10,815 tons of solid waste per day and has an estimated remaining capacity of 112,900,000 cubic yards or 96 percent. It is located on 1,084 acres of which 660 acres are used for waste disposal (CIWMB 2008).

Placer County

Placer County contracts waste collection and recycling services for unincorporated areas from two separate companies. Tahoe Truckee Sierra Disposal, who also manages the Eastern Regional Materials Recovery Facility, services the eastern portion of the county and directs waste to the Lockwood Landfill in Nevada. Auburn Placer Disposal Service provides waste removal services for the western portion of the County via three transfer stations. Waste from the western portion of the county, which would include the proposed Project, is directed to the Western Regional Landfill (Placer County 2008). The Western Regional Landfill is permitted to accept 1,900 tons of solid waste per day and has an estimated remaining capacity of 29,093,819 cubic yards or 80 percent. It is located on 281 acres of which 231 acres are used for waste disposal (CIWMB 2008).

Table 4.12-3: Landfill Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Landfill</th>
<th>Maximum Permitted Capacity (Cubic Yards)</th>
<th>Remaining Capacity (Cubic Yards)</th>
<th>Capacity Available (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>Yolo County Central Landfill</td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td>16,122,000</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>Ostrom Road Landfill (located in Yuba County)</td>
<td>41,822,300</td>
<td>40,600,000</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Sacramento County Landfill (Kiefer Landfill)</td>
<td>117,400,000</td>
<td>112,900,000</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>Western Regional Landfill</td>
<td>36,350,000</td>
<td>29,093,819</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Telephone, Internet, and Cable Television

Telephone service in the Project area is provided by AT&T (also known as SBC, Bell South, and SBC Pacific Bell), and SureWest. SureWest also provides internet and cable services within the Project area, as does Comcast.

4.12.2 Regulatory Setting

Federal

The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) establishes the “Transportation of Natural Gas by Pipeline: Minimum Federal Safety Standards” as required by 49 Code of Federal Regulations 192. These standards specify minimum safety requirements for pipeline facilities and transportation of gas via pipeline. The standards in the Federal regulations are more stringent for pipelines placed near high human population densities. Federal DOT regulations define area classifications, based on population density of the pipeline vicinity and on an area that extends for 660 feet (220 yards) on either side of the centerline of any continuous one-mile length of the pipeline. Class locations representing more populated areas require higher safety factors in pipeline design, testing, and operation. In addition to population density, other factors are used to determine the design factor used within a class location. A higher safety factor must be used in the design formula for steel pipelines that: (a) cross the ROW of an unimproved public road, without a casing; or (b) cross without a casing, or makes a parallel encroachment on the ROW of a hard-surfaced road, a highway, a public street, or a railroad. The design specifications for each of the pipeline area classes included as part of the Project are provided in Section 2.0, Project Description, Table 2-2. Section 2.0, Project Description, Figure 2-7 illustrates the pipeline area classifications along the proposed route. Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, also has more information on Federal DOT regulations.

State

Assembly Bill 939

Assembly Bill 939 (AB 939), enacted in 1989, required each city and/or county’s Source Reduction and Recycling Element to include an implementation schedule for the following: a 25 percent diversion of all solid waste from landfill disposal or transformation by January 1, 1995, through source reduction, recycling, and composting activities, followed by a 50 percent reduction to the waste stream by
January 1, 2000. The diversion rates for the counties through which the pipeline would traverse are included in Table 4.12-4

### Table 4.12-4: Waste Diversion Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Unincorporated Area Diversion Rate Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>63(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>59(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:
1. The Yuba/Sutter Regional Waste Management Authority is the only reporting waste diversion jurisdiction in Sutter County and does not report separate diversion rates for unincorporated areas within the county.
2. Unincorporated area diversion rates in Sacramento County include the City of Citrus Heights.


#### Local

Because the California Public Utilities Commission has exclusive jurisdiction over the design, location, construction, and operation of gas transmission facilities owned and operated by investor-owned public utilities, PG&E is not subject to local ordinances and regulations. Nonetheless, as part of its environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the following local regulations and policies have been considered in the assessment of impacts on population and housing, public services, utilities and other service systems.

**Yolo County**

The following goals, objectives, and policies regarding public services from the Yolo County General Plan were considered:

**Policy S 14. Fire, Basic:** Yolo County shall cooperate with the fire districts, enforce planning, zoning, and building codes and advise and encourage development to enhance fire safety.

**Policy S 17. Crime Protection and Avoidance:** Yolo County shall develop standards for location, construction, and operation of new development and
redevelopment to enhance public protection from crime and to avoid generating facilities conducive to crime.

Sutter County

The following goals, objectives, and policies regarding public services from the Sutter County General Plan were considered:

- **Policy 3.F-1:** The County shall maintain a sheriff force to protect the citizens and property within Sutter County.

- **Goal 3.G:** To minimize the risk of personal injury and property damage resulting from fire and provide for emergency medical response when, and to the extent, determined appropriate by the governing body.

- **Policy 3.G-2:** The County will strive to ensure that all proposed development applications are reviewed for compliance with adopted fire safety standards.

- **Policy 7.D-2:** The County shall require that new development, at a minimum, meets state standards for fire protection.

Sacramento County

The following goals, objectives, and policies regarding utilities and service systems from the Sacramento County General Plan were considered:

**Public Facilities Element**

**Section VI: Sheriff**

- **Objective:** Provide law enforcement services to the unincorporated area in accord with a commitment of crime prevention, control, and correction.

**Section VII: Fire Protection and Emergency Services**

- **Goal:** Efficient and effective fire protection and emergency response serving existing and new development.

- **Policy PF-62:** New development shall provide access arrangements pursuant to the requirements of the Uniform Fire Code.

**Section VIII: Energy Facilities**

- **Objective:** Minimize the health, safety, aesthetic, cultural, and biological impacts of energy facilities in Sacramento County.
Objective: Distribute natural gas safely and efficiently, and withdraw underground gas reserves in an environmentally sensitive manner.

Policy PF-118: Route new high-pressure gas mains within railway and electric transmission corridors, and along collector roads, and wherever possible, within existing easements. If not feasible these gas mains shall be placed as close to the easement as possible.

Housing Element

Goal: Promote an adequate supply of decent, safe, and affordable housing to meet the needs of all residents in Sacramento County without regard to race, color, age, sex, religion, natural origin, family status or disability.

Policy HE-1: The County shall maintain an adequate supply of residential and agricultural-residential zoned land to accommodate projected housing needs.

Policy HE-45: When feasible, integrate housing with compatible non-residential uses in an effort to located affordable housing near employment opportunities.

Policy HE-48: Support alternative living arrangement that provides affordability; especially for singles and the elderly.

Placer County

The following goals, objectives, and policies regarding public services from the Placer County General Plan were considered:

Goal 4.H: To provide adequate sheriff’s services to deter crime and to meet the growing demand for services associated with increasing population and commercial/industrial development in the County.

Policy 4.H.2: The County Sheriff shall strive to maintain the following average response times for emergency calls for service: a. 6 minutes in urban areas; b. 8 minutes in suburban areas; c. 15 minutes in rural areas; d. 20 minutes in remote rural areas.

Policy 4.H.4: The County shall require new development to develop or fund sheriff facilities that, at a minimum, maintain the above standards.
Goal 4.I: To protect residents of and visitors to Placer County from injury and loss of life and to protect property and watershed resources from fires.

Policy 4.I.2: The County shall encourage local fire protection agencies in the County to maintain the following standards (expressed as average response times to emergency calls): a. 4 minutes in urban areas; b. 6 minutes in suburban areas; c. 10 minutes in rural areas.

Policy 4.I.3: The County shall require new development to develop or fund fire protection facilities, personnel, and operations and maintenance that, at a minimum, maintains the above service level standards.

Policy 4.I.9: The County shall ensure that all proposed developments are reviewed for compliance with fire safety standards by responsible local fire agencies per the Uniform Fire Code and other County and local ordinances.

City of Roseville

The following goals, objectives, and policies regarding utilities and service systems from the City of Roseville General Plan were considered:

Public Facilities Element

Privately-Owned Utilities Goal 1: Work with privately-owned utility companies to ensure adequate service is provided in a timely manner for Roseville customers.

Policy 1: Provide for the review and comment of development proposals by non-City-owned utilities.

Policy 3: Require the provision of necessary utility easements in all new developments.

Policy 4: Work with non-City-owned utility providers to insure that uses and equipment are planned and constructed in a manner consistent with adopted land use policies and design guidelines, to the extent feasible.

Land Use Element

Policy 2.D: Develop design guidelines, specifying screening and a transition between public utilities (e.g. substations, pump stations) and other uses, in conjunction with the public utility departments and agencies. In addition,
development along power line and pipeline easements shall incorporate design treatment to insure compatibility and safety. Design guidelines and treatment may include minimum setbacks, building and landscape design standards and possible limitations on certain types of uses and activities.

4.12.3 Significance Criteria

An adverse impact to population and housing, public services, and utilities and service systems is considered significant and would require mitigation if Project construction or operation would:

1. Cause the vacancy rate for temporary housing to fall to less than 5 percent;
2. Increase the short- or long-term demand for public services, utilities, or service systems in excess of existing and projected capacities;
3. Cause a permanent population increase of 3 percent or more in a county affected by the Project; or
4. Displace a large number of people.

4.12.4 Applicant Proposed Measures

No APMs have been identified for population and housing, public services, or utilities and services systems.

4.12.5 Impact Analysis and Mitigation

Impact Discussion

The proposed Project would add a new major connection point to the existing Lines 400 and 401 and create a connection between the lower Sacramento Valley’s natural gas transmission system and PG&E’s backbone natural gas transmission system. Additionally, the Project would connect to existing Line 172 and Line 123 to further reinforce the reliability of the region’s natural gas system by providing a second large-diameter connection point between Lines 400 and 401 and existing pipelines serving the greater Sacramento Valley region. The purpose of this Project is to support existing and approved future planned population growth in the Project area and would not directly or indirectly increase population in the Project area. Effects on the Project area’s population and housing, public services, or utilities and service systems would coincide with the construction of the pipeline and would therefore be temporary.
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Vacancy Rate

The Project would not cause the vacancy rate for temporary housing to fall to less than 5 percent. Pipeline construction would require 90 to 130 workers, 75 to 100 of which would typically be non-PG&E contract employees, 5 to 15 would be from PG&E’s labor force and 10 to 15 would be contract inspectors. PG&E expects that construction personnel would come from the existing labor pool in the Project vicinity. These workers would be dispersed over several construction sites spread across the 40-mile pipeline Project. A maximum of approximately 90 workers would be onsite at any given time and would congregate at the same location only during the beginning or end of the workday. Construction is expected to last approximately ten months total over several phases.

Should these workers need temporary housing during the 10-month construction period, an ample number of hotels and motels are available near the Project area. Approximately ten lodging establishments are located in Woodland and are within a reasonable driving distance to the western portion of the pipeline. The Best Western Shadow Inn, located at 584 North East Street in Woodland, approximately 2.75 miles south of the proposed pipeline, reported that weekday vacancy rates are typically high but during weekends vacancy rates lower substantially. Within Natomas, a portion of northern Sacramento, ten hotels are within reasonable driving distance of the eastern portion of the pipeline. The Holiday Inn Express, located at 2981 Advantage Lane in Natomas, approximately 4 miles south of the proposed pipeline, reported that weekday vacancy rates usually fluctuate between 45 and 75 percent with periods of no vacancy depending on regional events. A representative at the Holiday Inn Express indicated that during times of large construction projects, such as the recent Fix-I-5 project in Downtown Sacramento, hotels in the area work together to accommodate demand. Construction of the Project may affect the overall availability of temporary housing. However, due to the short duration of the Project and the large number of hotels in close proximity to the proposed alignment, the Project would not cause the vacancy rate for temporary housing to fall below 5 percent. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant (Class III).

Increase Demand for Public Services in Excess of Capacities

The Project would not increase the short- or long-term demand for public services, utilities, or service systems in excess of existing and projected capacities. Increase in demand for public services, utilities, or service systems is generally related to population growth. Since the proposed Project would not result in any permanent
population growth, the demand for such services would not increase. Therefore, the
proposed Project would not create long-term increased demand for such services or
necessitate the construction of additional related facilities. Impacts would be less
than significant (Class III).

While the operation and maintenance of the Project would not result in an increased
demand in excess of public service capacities, minor short-term effects would occur.
These effects are discussed below.

Services

Fire Protection, Emergency Medical Services and Police Protection

Fire protection and emergency medical services would be provided by Elkhorn,
Knights Landing, Yolo, Madison, and Esparto Fire Stations in Yolo County; Sutter
Basin Fire Protection District and County Service Area D in Sutter County;
Sacramento Fire Department’s Station Number Three in Sacramento County; and
the Cook Riolo station in the Dry Creek Fire Service of the Placer County Fire
Department. Police protection services would be provided by the Yolo, Sutter,
Sacramento and Placer county Sheriff’s Departments. Additionally, the CHP’s
Valley Division patrols all State and county roads within the Project area. Increases
in demand for such services are generally associated with population growth. Since
both Project construction and operation are not expected to directly or indirectly
induce substantial population growth, demand for police protection services would
not be expected to increase.

Minor impacts to police response times could be affected indirectly as a result of
traffic associated with construction of the Project. Refer to Section 4.13,
Transportation and Traffic, for further discussion. Routes for emergency vehicles
would be maintained throughout Project construction areas to the maximum extent
feasible. Roadway closures would be coordinated with emergency service providers
as directed by the TMP for the Project (see Applicant Proposed Measure 15-3 in
Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic). At least one travel lane would be kept
open in areas where the pipeline crosses roadways during construction. Increases
in demand for such services are generally associated with population growth. Since
both Project construction and operation are not expected to directly or indirectly
induce substantial population growth, demand for fire protection and emergency
medical services would not be expected to increase. Therefore, the proposed
Project would not create a permanent increased demand for such services or
necessitate the construction of additional related facilities. Because the majority of
the fire stations which serve the proposed pipeline are staffed by volunteer fire
fighters, response times may be longer than those from fully staffed fire stations. As
such, response times to emergencies along the pipeline may be slightly longer.

A Fire Risk and Management Plan would be prepared by PG&E prior to Project
construction (see Applicant Proposed Measure 8-6 in Section 4.7, Hazards and
Hazardous Materials). The Plan would describe the potential for fire to occur as a
result of Project construction and would also describe measures necessary to
prevent fires.

According to the Climate Action Team of California, wildfires are likely to increase in
the future, especially as warming intensifies (CEPA 2006). An increase in
temperatures and decrease in annual rainfall would create conditions along the
proposed pipeline that are increasingly prone to fire hazards. Furthermore, the fires
may be greater in magnitude, frequency, and duration. Applicant Proposed
Measures and/or Mitigation Measures identified in Section 4.7, Hazards and
Hazardous Materials, would ensure that construction activities that may cause wildfire
be reduced to a less than significant level (Class III).

Implementation of the Fire Risk and Management Plan would ensure that impacts
related to fire protection and emergency medical services would be reduced to less
than significant (Class III).

Schools, Parks and Recreation

Because Project construction and operation would not result in growth-inducing
impacts, it would not increase demand or create a need for new facilities such as
schools, parks, or recreation areas.

Additionally, short-term impacts during Project construction would not result in
significant population growth or reduce the number of such facilities currently
available. While the pipeline would cross recreational areas such as the
Sacramento River, Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area, Sacramento River Ranch
Conservation Bank, and several Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation tracts, these
areas would remain open to regular recreational use during temporary Project
construction and would be returned to previous conditions upon Project completion
(Refer to Section 4.13, Recreation, for more information). Therefore, no new parks
or public facilities would be needed and impacts would be less than significant
(Class III).
Utilities and Service Systems

Project construction would not increase the demand or reduce the availability of utilities within the Project area. Operation of the pipeline would not create an increase in population and, therefore, would not increase demand or change existing levels of utility services. PG&E’s projections for their 10-year investment plan assume an additional 19,890 customers in an area where they are currently serving 675,000 customers. This represents a projected increase of 2.9 percent. However, this figure is substantially less than the estimated population growth (see Table 4.12-2) for the counties where the proposed Project would be located. The proposed Project would accommodate anticipated future population growth, but would not be growth inducing. Operation and maintenance of the Project would not result in significant impacts to utilities.

While the operation and maintenance of the Project would not result in an increased demand in excess of utility and service system capacities, minor short-term effects would occur. These effects are discussed below.

Electricity and Natural Gas

Electricity for lighting during construction would be powered by a diesel generator. At the 12 locations along the proposed pipeline where HDD would be implemented, lighting would be utilized to allow continuous, 24-hour construction operations. A temporary light plant would be stationed at the entry and exit points of each HDD section and would consist of four 1,000-watt fixtures.

During operation, the proposed Project would require minimal amounts of energy usage for the lighting located at the pressure limiting, pressure regulating, and metering stations. This lighting would only be used in emergency situations. Therefore, neither construction nor operation of the Project would increase short-term or long-term demand for electricity. Impacts to electricity would be less than significant (Class III).

The nature of this Project serves to increase natural gas infrastructure to the Northern Central Valley. Should this Project not be implemented, shortages in the delivery capability of the existing pipeline infrastructure could occur as early as 2009. Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not increase short-term demand for natural gas, but is intended to accommodate projected future demand. As such, impacts would be beneficial (Class IV).
Water and Wastewater

The proposed Project would not result in any structure requiring the permanent use of water and therefore, no wastewater would be created. However, pipeline construction water usage would include hydrostatic testing and dust control. Water for hydrostatic testing would be obtained from local agricultural wells, while water for dust control would be obtained from local agricultural wells and canals. The exact source of such water has not yet been determined but would be based on the availability and capacity of the water systems in the Project vicinity. Water quality would be measured from the water source prior to use and after use to assure that water quality is not compromised.

Overall, hydrostatic testing would use approximately 7.26 million gallons of water (22.3 acre feet). Specific locations for the discharge of hydrostatic test water have not yet been determined. Where possible, the test water would be discharged into trucks and used for dust control. When use of the water as dust control is not practical, the water would be discharged over land, in agricultural drain ditches or storm drains, or in sanitary sewers per local permits and ordinances. Such discharges would use a flow manifold and energy dissipater to control the rate of discharge and to minimize erosion and turbidity to meet the standards set forth under the terms and conditions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and the General Order for Dewatering and Other Low Threat Discharges to Surface Waters, issued by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB). Occurrences of water discharge from hydrostatic testing would be limited to the period of construction. Impacts would be less than significant (Class III).

Solid Waste and Recycling Service

Operation of the proposed Project would not produce any solid waste. Construction activities are expected to produce a small amount of construction-related waste that would not adversely affect landfills near the Project area. An approximation of the amount of waste resulting from Project construction is not yet known. PG&E would implement solid waste management BMP 2-04 that would insure the proper disposal and waste diversion measures are completed to the maximum extent feasible. BMP 2-04 contains provisions for site housekeeping, onsite water storage areas, and drainage management. Local landfills, which have adequate capacity as demonstrated in Table 4.12-3, would likely be the location of waste disposal. As such, short-term impacts to waste and recycling services would not be in excess of existing capacities. Impact would be less than significant (Class III).
Underground Utility Lines and/or Facilities

Construction and operation of this Project would not require the use of existing underground utility lines and or facilities other than those owned by PG&E and connected to the proposed pipeline. The Project would not increase the short- or long-term demand for existing underground utility lines or facilities in excess of their existing and projected capacities. Impacts in this respect would be less than significant (Class III).

Activities taking place during construction of the proposed Project could inadvertently contact other underground utility lines or facilities, possibly leading to short-term service interruptions. However, utilization of the Underground Service Alert system would notify PG&E of any underground utilities in the vicinity. Parties responsible for other utilities within the Project area would either mark or stake the location of such facilities. This standard practice would reduce possible short-term impacts to a less than significant level (Class III).

Population Increase

Impacts on the Project vicinity’s population are expected to be temporary and relatively small in comparison to the populations of the affected counties. Due to the short duration of the Project, it is not expected that temporary workers would relocate their families. The estimated 90 to 130 workers that are expected to work on the proposed Project would not result in a significant impact related to population growth in Yolo, Sutter, Sacramento, or Placer counties. Operation of the completed pipeline would not require full-time personnel. PG&E employees who are presently responsible for the many existing PG&E facilities in the Project vicinity would perform regular maintenance of the proposed pipeline and no new employees would be required. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant (Class III).

The proposed Project is designed to increase the supply and stability to the existing gas transmission infrastructure and would not directly connect to homes or businesses. The proposed pipeline is intended to increase infrastructure that would serve existing and future planned population growth within the Project area. PG&E’s projections for their 10-year investment plan assume an additional 19,890 customers in an area where they are currently serving 675,000 customers. This represents a projected increase of 2.9 percent. However, this figure is substantially less than the estimated population growth (see Table 4.12-2) for the counties where the proposed Project would be located. Since PG&E has an obligation to serve public utility needs, and the Project accommodates existing and approved growth, the Project
would not directly induce population growth. No significant permanent impacts to
population are expected to occur as a direct result of this Project. The temporary
relocation of construction workers would not cause a permanent population increase
of 3 percent or more in affected counties. Impacts would be less than significant
(Class III).

**Displace People**

The Project would not displace a large number of people. Construction personnel
from outside the local area are expected to utilize temporary housing such as hotels,
motels, apartments and campgrounds. Table 4.12-3 summarizes the Project area's
housing and vacancy rates. Total housing units in each county range between
33,069 in Sutter County and 545,287 in Sacramento County. Vacancy rates range
between 3.53 percent in Yolo County and 10.82 percent in Placer County. While
construction personnel may temporarily rent housing units, it is more likely that
short-term housing, such as hotels and motels, would be used. The number of local
hotels and motels range from 494 in Placer County to more than 10,000 in
Sacramento County. Vacancy rates in Yolo, Sutter, and Placer Counties are
typically high. Periods of low vacancy rates in Sacramento County could reduce the
number of available rooms to below 1,000. However, this remaining availability is
still above both Sutter and Placer counties’ total rooms. According to previous
PG&E pipeline construction documentation, approximately 30 percent of out-of-area
workers would provide their own housing in the form of travel trailers or other
recreation vehicles. After completion of the pipeline, no new employees would be
required for maintenance or operation.

Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in the destruction or relocation of
any housing. The proposed alignment would utilize county roads, farm roads,
agricultural fields and other ROWs to the maximum extent feasible and would
therefore not result in the displacement of people, housing or businesses. As such,
impact would be less than significant (Class III).

**4.12.6 Impacts of Alternatives**

A No Project Alternative as well as twelve options have been proposed for the
alignment in order to minimize or eliminate environmental impacts of the proposed
Project and to respond to comments from nearby landowners. The twelve options,
labeled A through L, have been analyzed in comparison to the portion of the
proposed route that has been avoided as a result of the option. Descriptions of the
options can be found in Section 3.0, Alternatives and Cumulative Projects, and are depicted in Figure 3-2A through 3-2K.

**No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project Alternative, a natural gas pipeline would not be constructed. As such, this alternative would cause no impacts to population, housing, public services, utilities or service systems.

**Option A**

Option A is located approximately 1.3 miles to the north of the proposed alignment and would lengthen the pipeline by 2,200 feet. Similar to the proposed Project, Option A would not result in permanent relocation of construction workers. Also similar to the proposed Project, the maximum number of on-site workers required to construct Option A would not exceed 90 at any given time. As such, Option A would require the same amount of temporary housing as the proposed Project and would result in less than significant impacts (Class III) to local vacancy rates. Option A would not result in the destruction or relocation of any housing or displace a large number of people.

Similar to the proposed project, Option A would not result in population growth and therefore would have less than significant (Class III) impacts to public services. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to utilities and service systems such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, solid waste, recycling or underground utility lines and facilities would be less than significant (Class III).

**Option B**

Option B is located approximately 1.3 miles to the north of the proposed alignment and would lengthen the pipeline by 2,640 feet. Similar to the proposed Project, Option B would not result in permanent relocation of construction workers. Also similar to the proposed Project, the maximum number of on-site workers required to construct Option B would not exceed 90 at any given time. As such, Option B would require the same amount of temporary housing as the proposed Project and would result in less than significant impacts (Class III) to local vacancy rates. Option B would not result in the destruction or relocation of any housing or displace a large number of people.

Similar to the proposed project, Option B would not result in population growth and therefore would have less than significant (Class III) impacts to public services.
Similar to the proposed project, impacts to utilities and service systems such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, solid waste, recycling or underground utility lines and facilities would be less than significant (Class III).

Option C

Under Option C, the length of Line 406 would be increased by approximately 1,150 feet. Similar to the proposed Project, Option C would not result in permanent relocation of construction workers. Also similar to the proposed Project, the maximum number of on-site workers required to construct Option C would not exceed 90 at any given time. As such, Option C would require the same amount of temporary housing as the proposed Project and would result in less than significant impacts (Class III) to local vacancy rates. Option C would not result in the destruction or relocation of any housing or displace a large number of people.

Similar to the proposed project, Option C would not result in population growth and therefore would have less than significant (Class III) impacts to public services. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to utilities and service systems such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, solid waste, recycling or underground utility lines and facilities would be less than significant (Class III).

Option D

Under Option D the length of Line 406 would be increased by approximately 860 feet. Similar to the proposed Project, Option D would not result in permanent relocation of construction workers. Also similar to the proposed Project, the maximum number of on-site workers required to construct Option D would not exceed 90 at any given time. As such, Option D would require the same amount of temporary housing as the proposed Project and would result in less than significant impacts (Class III) to local vacancy rates. Option D would not result in the destruction or relocation of any housing or displace a large number of people.

Similar to the proposed project, Option D would not result in population growth and therefore would have less than significant (Class III) impacts to public services. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to utilities and service systems such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, solid waste, recycling or underground utility lines and facilities would be less than significant (Class III).
Option E

Under Option E the length of Line 406 would be increased by approximately 3,480 feet. Similar to the proposed Project, Option E would not result in permanent relocation of construction workers. Also similar to the proposed Project, the maximum number of on-site workers required to construct Option E would not exceed 90 at any given time. As such, Option E would require the same amount of temporary housing as the proposed Project and would result in less than significant impacts (Class III) to local vacancy rates. Option E would not result in the destruction or relocation of any housing or displace a large number of people.

Similar to the proposed project, Option E would not result in population growth and therefore would have less than significant (Class III) impacts to public services. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to utilities and service systems such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, solid waste, recycling or underground utility lines and facilities would be less than significant (Class III).

Option F

Option F involves a minor location shift and would not change the overall length of the proposed alignment. Similar to the proposed Project, Option F would not result in permanent relocation of construction workers. Also similar to the proposed Project, the maximum number of on-site workers required to construct Option F would not exceed 90 at any given time. As such, Option F would require the same amount of temporary housing as the proposed Project and would result in less than significant impacts (Class III) to local vacancy rates. Option F would not result in the destruction or relocation of any housing or displace a large number of people.

Similar to the proposed project, Option F would not result in population growth and therefore would have less than significant (Class III) impacts to public services. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to utilities and service systems such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, solid waste, recycling or underground utility lines and facilities would be less than significant (Class III).

Option G

Option G involves a minor location shift and would not change the overall length of the proposed alignment. Similar to the proposed Project, Option G would not result in permanent relocation of construction workers. Also similar to the proposed Project, the maximum number of on-site workers required to construct Option G
would not exceed 90 at any given time. As such, Option G would require the same amount of temporary housing as the proposed Project and would result in less than significant impacts (Class III) to local vacancy rates. Option G would not result in the destruction or relocation of any housing or displace a large number of people.

Similar to the proposed project, Option G would not result in population growth and therefore would have less than significant (Class III) impacts to public services. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to utilities and service systems such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, solid waste, recycling or underground utility lines and facilities would be less than significant (Class III).

**Option H**

Under Option H the length of Line 407 W would be reduced by approximately 2,900 feet. Similar to the proposed Project, Option H would not result in permanent relocation of construction workers. Also similar to the proposed Project, the maximum number of on-site workers required to construct Option H would not exceed 90 at any given time. As such, Option H would require the same amount of temporary housing as the proposed Project and would result in less than significant impacts (Class III) to local vacancy rates. Option H would not result in the destruction or relocation of any housing or displace a large number of people.

Similar to the proposed project, Option H would not result in population growth and therefore would have less than significant (Class III) impacts to public services. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to utilities and service systems such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, solid waste, recycling or underground utility lines and facilities would be less than significant (Class III).

**Option I**

Under Option I, the length of Line 407 E would be increased approximately 2,900 feet. Similar to the proposed Project, Option I would not result in permanent relocation of construction workers. Also similar to the proposed Project, the maximum number of on-site workers required to construct Option I would not exceed 90 at any given time. As such, Option I would require the same amount of temporary housing as the proposed Project and would result in less than significant impacts (Class III) to local vacancy rates. Option I would not result in the destruction or relocation of any housing or displace a large number of people.
Similar to the proposed project, Option I would not result in population growth and therefore would have less than significant (Class III) impacts to public services. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to utilities and service systems such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, solid waste, recycling or underground utility lines and facilities would be less than significant (Class III).

**Option J**

Under Option J, the length of Line 407 E would be increased by approximately 5,250 feet. Similar to the proposed Project, Option J would not result in permanent relocation of construction workers. Also similar to the proposed Project, the maximum number of on-site workers required to construct Option J would not exceed 90 at any given time. As such, Option J would require the same amount of temporary housing as the proposed Project and would result in less than significant impacts (Class III) to local vacancy rates. Option J would not result in the destruction or relocation of any housing or displace a large number of people.

Similar to the proposed project, Option J would not result in population growth and therefore would have less than significant (Class III) impacts to public services. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to utilities and service systems such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, solid waste, recycling or underground utility lines and facilities would be less than significant (Class III).

**Option K**

Under Option K, the length of Line 407 E would be increased by approximately 70 feet. Similar to the proposed Project, Option K would not result in permanent relocation of construction workers. Also similar to the proposed Project, the maximum number of on-site workers required to construct Option K would not exceed 90 at any given time. As such, Option K would require the same amount of temporary housing as the proposed Project and would result in less than significant impacts (Class III) to local vacancy rates. Option K would not result in the destruction or relocation of any housing or displace a large number of people.

Similar to the proposed project, Option K would not result in population growth and therefore would have less than significant (Class III) impacts to public services. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to utilities and service systems such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, solid waste, recycling or underground utility lines and facilities would be less than significant (Class III).
Option L

Option L would not increase or decrease the length of Line 407 E. Similar to the proposed Project, Option L would not result in permanent relocation of construction workers. Also similar to the proposed Project, the maximum number of on-site workers required to construct Option L would not exceed 90 at any given time. As such, Option L would require the same amount of temporary housing as the proposed Project and would result in less than significant impacts (Class III) to local vacancy rates. Option L would not result in the destruction or relocation of any housing or displace a large number of people.

Similar to the proposed project, Option L would not result in population growth and therefore would have less than significant (Class III) impacts to public services. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to utilities and service systems such as electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, solid waste, recycling or underground utility lines and facilities would be less than significant (Class III).

Table 4.12-5: Comparison of Alternatives for Population and Housing/Public Services/Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Comparison with Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>No Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Similar Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>Similar Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C</td>
<td>Similar Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option D</td>
<td>Similar Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option E</td>
<td>Similar Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option F</td>
<td>Similar Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option G</td>
<td>Similar Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option H</td>
<td>Similar Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option I</td>
<td>Similar Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option J</td>
<td>Similar Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option K</td>
<td>Similar Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option L</td>
<td>Similar Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.12.7 Cumulative Projects Impact Analysis

Section 3.0, Alternatives and Cumulative Projects, provides a description of identifiable projects that may be constructed in close proximity to the proposed Project. Specifically, the Placer Vineyards Specific Area Plan and the Sierra Vista Specific Plan are both scheduled to begin in 2008 and are located south and north, respectively, of the eastern end of Line 407 East. Both of the aforementioned projects have potential cumulative impacts related to the proposed Project.

While this Project would not contribute to cumulative impacts related to demand for public services or displace a large amounts of people, construction of this Project, in conjunction with other projects, may result in a cumulative impact to temporary housing and population growth.

Temporary Housing

Should the construction schedules of projects included in the Placer Vineyards Specific Area Plan or the Sierra Vista Specific Plan coincide, the amount of non-local construction workers requiring temporary housing and other public services may increase. The proposed Project’s contribution to this cumulative impact would be temporary in nature as the proposed pipeline’s construction period would only last 10 months total (in several phases). In addition, construction workers on the proposed Project would be spread out along the pipeline and would not necessarily utilize temporary housing near the Placer Vineyards or Sierra Vista areas. As such, cumulative impacts to available temporary housing would occur during the length of time that construction schedules would overlap.

Population Growth

Upon completion, operation of the proposed Project, along with the Placer Vineyards Specific Area Plan and Sierra Vista Specific Plan, would not contribute to cumulative population growth. While the pipeline would not directly connect to housing or businesses, it would provide the ability for future housing or businesses to receive natural gas through additional distribution infrastructure. However, it should be noted that PG&E’s projections for their 10-year investment plan assume an additional 19,890 customers in an area where they are currently serving 675,000 customers. This represents a projected increase of 2.9 percent. This figure is substantially less than estimated population growth (see Table 4.12-2) for the counties where the proposed Project would be located. The potential for the Project
to result in growth inducing impacts is discussed in Section 6.0, Other Required CEQA Sections.

The Placer Vineyards Specific Plan would be implemented over a 20 to 30 year period and would ultimately have a population of approximately 33,000 people. The Plan specifies that natural gas service would be provided via an existing distribution main located at the corner of Baseline Road and Cook Riolo Road. A distribution main along Baseline Road and a transmission main along PFE Road would deliver natural gas to the Plan’s area. As such, Placer Vineyards would not directly connect to the proposed Project but would benefit from the capacity and reliability that would be added to the regional natural gas transmission system resulting from the implementation of this Project.

The Sierra Vista Specific Plan includes approximately 9,995 residential units providing housing for approximately 25,219 people at build-out. An Initial Study completed for the Sierra Vista Specific Plan identifies that natural gas service would be provided to the Plan’s area via existing and planned infrastructure adjacent to the Sierra Vista project site. Additionally, the Initial Study concludes that the Plan has the potential to induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly. As such, the Placer Vineyards Plan, and the Sierra Vista Specific Plan, along with the proposed Project, would result in cumulative impacts and would cause a permanent population increase of 3 percent or more in Placer County.

Displace People

The Placer Vineyards and Sierra Vista Specific Plan areas are currently comprised of agricultural or undeveloped lands. The proposed Project alignment mostly occurs on agricultural lands and would not displace large numbers of people. When considered along with the proposed Project, these two projects would not displace large numbers of people. Therefore, there would not be any cumulative impacts with respect to this criterion. The natural gas needs of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan would be reviewed by PG&E upon request for need, and may or may not require this Project. The Placer Vineyards Specific Plan indicates that PG&E maintains three natural gas pipelines in its project area, and indicates an extension is already planned, but does not specifically identify this Project.

4.12.8 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This purpose of this Project is to support existing and approved future planned population growth in the Project vicinity and would not directly or indirectly increase
permanent population in the Project area. PG&E’s planned increases in natural gas
in Lines 406 and 407 would accommodate demand for anticipated residential and
small commercial entity gas consumption. Average annual gas throughput and
residential demand for gas would both grow at an annual average of about 3
percent. The customers that could be served by the proposed pipeline would not be
solely dependent on the proposed Project for natural gas. Projected new residential
demand that would occur as a result of implementation of the Placer Vineyards and
Sutter Pointe Specific Plans have already been anticipated. As a result, the addition
or lack of natural gas associated with the proposed Project would not likely affect
development in the region.

Increase in demand for housing, public services, and service systems are generally
associated with population growth. Since both Project construction and operation
are not expected to directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth,
demand for such services are not expected to increase. As stated previously, the
proposed Project would meet some but not all of future demands for natural gas.
Therefore, impacts to population, housing, public services, and services systems
would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.