

1 **4.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING/PUBLIC SERVICES/UTILITIES AND**  
2 **SERVICE SYSTEMS**

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

6 **4.12.1 Environmental Setting**

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

13 **Population and Housing**

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

25 *Population*

26 Yolo County

27 Yolo County has a land area of 1,013.27 square miles with a population density of  
28 166.5 persons per square mile (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). As of 2005,  
29 approximately 12 percent of the population lived in unincorporated areas of the  
30 county. Between 1990 and 2000, the county's population increased from 141,210 to  
31 168,660, or 0.9 percent per year. Between 2000 and 2006, the population increased  
32 to 188,085 (U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts), or 1.9 percent per year. The  
33 California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates Yolo County to have a population

1 of 193,983 as of January 1, 2007, and population growth within the county is  
2 expected to continue, reaching 245,052 by 2020 and 327,982 by 2050, growing  
3 annually by 2 percent, and 1.1 percent, respectively.

4 Sutter County

5 Sutter County has a land area of 602.54 square miles with a population density of  
6 130.9 persons per square mile (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). As of 2005,  
7 approximately 26 percent of the population lived in unincorporated areas of the  
8 county. Between 1990 and 2000, the county's population increased from 64,415 to  
9 78,930, or 2.2 percent per year. Between 2000 and 2006, the population grew to  
10 91,410 (U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts). The DOF estimates Sutter County's  
11 population at 93,919 as of January 1, 2007, and population growth is expected to  
12 continue, reaching 141,159 by 2020 and 282,894 by 2050.

13 Sacramento County

14 Sacramento County has a land area of 965.65 square miles with a population  
15 density of 1,266.6 persons per square mile (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). As of 2005,  
16 approximately 34 percent of the population lived in unincorporated areas of the  
17 county. Between the years of 1990 and 2000, the population increased from  
18 1,041,219 to 1,223,499. Between 2000 and 2006, the population increased to  
19 1,374,724 (U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts). Sacramento County has the highest  
20 population (at 1,387,771 as of January 1, 2007 as estimated by the DOF) relative to  
21 the other counties through which the proposed pipeline would be constructed.

22 Placer County

23 Placer County has a land area of 1,404.37 square miles with a population density of  
24 179.9 persons per square mile (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). As of 2005,  
25 approximately 34 percent lived in unincorporated areas of the county. Between the  
26 years of 1990 and 2000, the population increased from 172,796 to 248,399.  
27 Between 2000 and 2006, the population grew to 326,242 (U.S. Census Bureau  
28 Quick Facts). The population of Placer County, as of January 1, 2007, was  
29 estimated by the DOF as 324,495 and is expected to grow to 428,535 by 2020 and  
30 751,208 by 2050.

31 Table 4.12-1 shows population projections by county.

32

**Table 4.12-1: Population Projections by County**

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

Source: California Department of Finance 2004.

**Table 4.12-2: Projected Area Housing Units**

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

Sources: Sacramento Area Council of Demographics 2007, U.S. Census Bureau 2006.

1 *Housing*

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

8 Yolo County

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

15 Sutter County

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

21 Sacramento County

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

30 Placer County

31 Placer County has approximately 144,207 housing units with a 10.82 percent  
32 vacancy rate (DOF 2007). Approximately 77.99 percent, the highest out of the four  
33 counties, consist of single-family detached housing while multiple family structures

1 with five or more units account for approximately 11.46 percent. Approximately 494  
2 hotel rooms are available with high vacancy rates (PG&E 2007).

### 3 **Public Services**

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

#### 7 *Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services*

##### 8 Yolo County

9 Yolo County has 19 fire districts. The proposed Project lies within five of those  
10 districts: Elkhorn, Knights Landing, Yolo, Madison, and Esparto. Each district has  
11 one fire station. The Elkhorn Fire Department is located at 19396 County Road (CR)  
12 124 in West Sacramento. The Knights Landing Fire Department is located at 42115  
13 Sixth Street in Knights Landing. The Yolo Fire Protection District's headquarters are  
14 located at 37720 Sacramento Street in Yolo. The Madison Fire Department is  
15 located at 17880 Stephens Street in Madison. The Esparto Fire Protection District is  
16 headquartered at 16960 Yolo Avenue in Esparto. Each station is located within  
17 approximately 3 to 5 miles of the Project area, with the exception of the Yolo Fire  
18 Station, which is approximately 0.5 mile from the Project area, near the Interstate 5  
19 (I-5) crossing. The majority of the personnel in each district are volunteers whose  
20 numbers fluctuate depending on the season.

##### 21 Sutter County

22 Sutter County has six fire service districts. Of the six fire districts, the Sutter Basin  
23 Fire Protection District and County Service Area D are located within the Project  
24 area. The fire stations that are charged with responding to emergencies within the  
25 Project area are the Pleasant Grove Fire Department, located at 3100 Howsley  
26 Road in Pleasant Grove and the Robins-Sutter Basin Fire Department, located at  
27 2340 California Street in Sutter. The Pleasant Grove Fire Department is staffed by  
28 volunteers on an on-call basis. The Robins-Sutter Basin Fire Department is staffed  
29 with three unit personnel, one engineer, one station captain, and approximately 12  
30 volunteers. These two Fire Departments are approximately 5 and 10 miles away  
31 from the pipeline, respectively. All Sutter County fire districts are able to provide  
32 medical aid at the basic life support level with the ability to perform emergency  
33 cardiac shock (defibrillation). County Service Area F has a Hazardous Materials  
34 Response Team, which includes equipment and personnel trained to mitigate

1 hazardous materials releases. Although not stationed in the immediate Project area,  
2 this team would respond to any hazardous material incident in the Project area.

3 Sacramento County

4 Sacramento County's northwestern boundary lies approximately 1.25 miles to the  
5 south of the proposed Line 407 East. The proposed Powerline Road DFM extends  
6 south from the junction of Line 407 East and Line 407 West approximately 2 miles  
7 into the northwestern corner of Sacramento County. The Sacramento Fire  
8 Department, comprising 25 stations, serves this area. The DFM is approximately  
9 4.5 miles from the Natomas Fire District's Station Number 3, located at 7280 West  
10 Elkhorn Boulevard. Station Number 3 is responsible for first response in the  
11 Powerline Road DFM Project area and is generally staffed by three to four personnel  
12 members at any given time (Melton 2008).

13 Placer County

14 Approximately 6.25 miles of Line 407 East extends into the southwestern portion of  
15 Placer County. This area is part of the Dry Creek Fire Service area and is served by  
16 the Placer County Fire Department. The Cook Riolo Station, which is the nearest to  
17 the Project area, is located approximately 1 mile to the east. This station has two  
18 fire captains, one full-time firefighter-engineer, one part-time firefighter-engineer,  
19 2.33 full-time firefighters, and one part-time firefighter (Brooks 2008).

20 *Police Protection*

21 Yolo County

22 The unincorporated areas of Yolo County are served by the Yolo County Sheriff's  
23 Department which is divided into three major divisions: Administrative and Support  
24 Services, Detention Services, and Field Operations. The Department has 276  
25 employees of which 95 are sworn personnel (Yolo County Sheriff's Department  
26 2008). The closest station is located approximately 6 miles south of the Line 407  
27 West Project area, within the City of Woodland at 2500 East Gibson Road.

28 Sutter County

29 The unincorporated areas of Sutter County are served by the Sutter County Sheriff's  
30 Department consisting of 57 sworn personnel. The department is headquartered at  
31 1077 Civic Center Boulevard in Yuba City, approximately 30 miles north of the  
32 Project site. Two additional substations are located in Live Oak and Sutter and are  
33 29.5 and 37 miles from the Project, respectively.

1 Sacramento County

2 The unincorporated areas of Sacramento County are served by the Sacramento  
3 County Sheriff Department. The department headquarters are located at 711 G  
4 Street in downtown Sacramento. Of the 11 substations in the county, the nearest  
5 substation to the Powerline Road DFM is the Northwest Service Center located at  
6 7511 Watt Avenue, approximately 11 miles east of the Project area. The Northwest  
7 Division has 76 sworn officers and is broken down into five zones, with zone 1  
8 covering the Project area. In addition, the Sacramento International Airport has  
9 Sheriffs on patrol 24 hours a day and is located directly south of the DFM.

10 Placer County

11 The unincorporated areas of Placer County are served by the Placer County  
12 Sheriff's Department. The Department is headquartered in the City of Auburn at  
13 2929 Richardson Drive with two additional substations and service centers located  
14 throughout the county. The South Placer Substation in Loomis is responsible for  
15 servicing the eastern most extent of the Project area and is located at 6140  
16 Horseshoe Bar Road, approximately 12 miles northeast of the Project site. The  
17 Substation is staffed by approximately 50 personal including 33 patrol positions.  
18 The West Roseville/Dry creek area, which covers the Project area, has a patrol  
19 officer on duty 24 hours a day.

20 California Highway Patrol

21 Yolo, Sutter, Sacramento, and Placer counties are served by the California Highway  
22 Patrol's Valley Division. The Valley Division has 16 area offices, and 785 uniformed  
23 officers. The CHP's Valley Division oversees all State and county roads within the  
24 Project area. The Area Office closest to the Project area is located in Woodland at  
25 1975 Wintun Drive, approximately 4.5 miles south of the proposed alignment.

26 Schools

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

1 Yolo County

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

15 Sutter County

16 Sutter County is served by 10 elementary school districts and 4 high school districts.  
17 The Marcum-Illinois Union and Pleasant Grove Elementary Districts, along with the  
18 East Nicolaus Joint Union High School District, serve the Project area. Both  
19 elementary districts consist of one school each and combined serve approximately  
20 1,111 K-8 students. The East Nicolaus District consists of one high school and one  
21 continuation school, which combined serve approximately 332 students. No schools  
22 are located within 0.5 mile of the Project area in Sutter County.

23 Sacramento County

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

30 Placer County

31 Placer County is served by 17 primary and secondary education school districts, of  
32 which, two serve the Project area. The Dry Creek Elementary School District is  
33 comprised of six elementary schools and two middle schools that combined serve  
34 approximately 7,377 students. The Roseville Joint Union High School District

1 consists of six high schools, enrolling approximately 8,918 students. In Placer  
2 County there are two schools within 0.5 mile of the proposed Project; the Alpha  
3 School (historical) is approximately 0.5 mile north of Line 407 along Baseline Road,  
4 and the Coyote Ridge Elementary School is approximately 0.4 mile north-northeast  
5 of the eastern terminus of Line 407 at the intersection of Baseline Road and Fair  
6 Oaks Boulevard.

7 *Hospitals and Convalescent Homes*

8 The two closest emergency medical facilities to the Project area are Woodland  
9 Memorial Hospital in Woodland, approximately 5.5 miles from the west end of Line  
10 407 West, and Sutter Roseville Medical Center in Roseville, approximately 5.8 miles  
11 from the east end of Line 407 East. Both Woodland and Roseville have several  
12 other healthcare facilities, including hospitals and convalescent homes, located  
13 within their city boundaries. No hospitals, convalescent homes, or medical centers  
14 are within 0.5 mile of the Project area.

15 *Parks and Recreation*

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

24 **Utilities**

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

29 *Electricity and Natural gas*

30 PG&E provides electric power and natural gas to Yolo, Sutter and most of Placer  
31 counties. Sacramento County, as well as a small portion of Placer County, is  
32 provided with electricity by the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD). Within  
33 Placer County, the City of Roseville receives electricity from Roseville Electric, which

1 serves approximately 41,883 residential and 5,410 commercial customers within the  
2 city limits.

### 3 **Service Systems**

#### 4 *Water and Wastewater*

##### 5 Yolo County

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

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

##### 21 Sutter County

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

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

##### 28 Sacramento County

29 Within Sacramento County, there are 28 water purveyors responsible for treating  
30 and distributing surface and groundwater as well as securing surface water rights  
31 (Sacramento County General Plan). The Sacramento County Department of Water  
32 Resources (SCDWR), within Sacramento County's Municipal Services Agency,

1 manages surface water and groundwater resources via the Sacramento County  
2 Water Agency (SCWA). The SCWA is responsible for providing water to all areas  
3 not served by one of the purveyors. The SCDWR provides services such as  
4 drainage, flood control, and water supply to various areas in unincorporated  
5 Sacramento County. In addition to the SCDWR, more than 20 public and private  
6 water districts provide water supply service in unincorporated areas of Sacramento  
7 County. The Natomas Central Mutual Water Company is the primary irrigation water  
8 supplier within the Powerline Road DFM Project area.

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

17 Placer County

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

30 *Solid Waste and Recycling Service*

31 Solid waste and recycling services for the Project area are discussed below. A  
32 summary of landfill capacity is provided in Table 4.12-3.

1 Yolo County

2 Waste Management, Inc. is a private company that is contracted with Yolo County  
3 and a majority of the cities within Yolo County to provide garbage and recycling  
4 collection and disposal services. There are two landfills in the county: the Yolo  
5 County Central Landfill, and the University of California, Davis Landfill, which serves  
6 the University. A transfer station is located in Esparto. The Yolo County Central  
7 Landfill is located northeast of Davis at CR 28H and CR 104 on 724 acres of which  
8 473 acres are used for waste disposal. This landfill is permitted to accept 1,800 tons  
9 of solid waste per day and has an estimated remaining capacity of 16,122,000 cubic  
10 yards or 64 percent (CIWMB 2008).

11 Sutter County

12 Yuba-Sutter Disposal, Inc., a subsidiary of Norcal Waste Systems, Inc., provides  
13 recycling and solid waste collection services to residential and commercial  
14 customers in Live Oak, Marysville, Wheatland, Knights Landing, Yuba City, Beale Air  
15 Force Base, and the counties of Yuba and Sutter. Additionally, the company  
16 operates two transfer stations, a materials recovery facility, one household  
17 hazardous waste collection facility, one buy-back center, and a composting facility.  
18 (Yuba-Sutter Disposal, Inc. 2008). Yuba-Sutter Disposal, Inc. serves more than  
19 30,000 residential customers and 5,000 commercial customers, and collects more  
20 than 100,000 tons of materials annually within their service area.

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

29 Sacramento County

30 Sacramento County's Department of Waste Management & Recycling provides  
31 waste management for residents and businesses in the northern unincorporated  
32 areas of the county. Residents living in the unincorporated areas of the county  
33 south of Calvine Road receive waste management and recycling services provided  
34 by Central Valley Waste Services, a private waste-hauling firm under contract with

1 Sacramento County. The Sacramento County Landfill (also referred to as the Kiefer  
 2 Landfill) is the primary municipal solid waste disposal facility in Sacramento County,  
 3 and is the only landfill facility in Sacramento County permitted to accept household  
 4 waste from the public. Kiefer Landfill is located at 12701 Kiefer Boulevard in Slough  
 5 house. This landfill is permitted to accept 10,815 tons of solid waste per day and  
 6 has an estimated remaining capacity of 112,900,000 cubic yards or 96 percent. It is  
 7 located on 1,084 acres of which 660 acres are used for waste disposal (CIWMB  
 8 2008).

9 Placer County

10 Placer County contracts waste collection and recycling services for unincorporated  
 11 areas from two separate companies. Tahoe Truckee Sierra Disposal, who also  
 12 manages the Eastern Regional Materials Recovery Facility, services the eastern  
 13 portion of the county and directs waste to the Lockwood Landfill in Nevada. Auburn  
 14 Placer Disposal Service provides waste removal services for the western portion of  
 15 the County via three transfer stations. Waste from the western portion of the county,  
 16 which would include the proposed Project, is directed to the Western Regional  
 17 Landfill (Placer County 2008). The Western Regional Landfill is permitted to accept  
 18 1,900 tons of solid waste per day and has an estimated remaining capacity of  
 19 29,093,819 cubic yards or 80 percent. It is located on 281 acres of which 231 acres  
 20 are used for waste disposal (CIWMB 2008).

21 **Table 4.12-3: Landfill Capacity**

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

Source: California Integrated Waste Management. Facility/Site Summary Details (SWIS) Online: <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/SWIS/Search.asp> (Accessed May 20, 2008).

22

1 *Telephone, Internet, and Cable Television*

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

5 **4.12.2 Regulatory Setting**

6 **Federal**

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

27 **State**

28 *Assembly Bill 939*

29 Assembly Bill 939 (AB 939), enacted in 1989, required each city and/or county’s  
30 Source Reduction and Recycling Element to include an implementation schedule for  
31 the following: a 25 percent diversion of all solid waste from landfill disposal or  
32 transformation by January 1, 1995, through source reduction, recycling, and  
33 composting activities, followed by a 50 percent reduction to the waste stream by

1 January 1, 2000. The diversion rates for the counties through which the pipeline  
 2 would traverse are included in Table 4.12-4

3 **Table 4.12-4: Waste Diversion Rates**

County	Unincorporated Area Diversion Rate Percentage	
	2005	2006
Yolo	67	71
Sutter	63 <sup>1</sup>	65 <sup>1</sup>
Sacramento	59 <sup>2</sup>	56 <sup>2</sup>
Placer	56	55
Footnotes: <sup>1</sup> 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. <sup>2</sup> Unincorporated area diversion rates in Sacramento County include the City of Citrus Heights. Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board, Countywide, Region wide, and Statewide Jurisdiction Diversion Progress Report. <a href="http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/mars/jurdrsta.asp">http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/mars/jurdrsta.asp</a> . (Accessed May 14, 2008).		

4

5 **Local**

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

13 *Yolo County*

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

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

19 **Policy S 17. Crime Protection and Avoidance:** Yolo County shall develop  
 20 standards for location, construction, and operation of new development and

1 redevelopment to enhance public protection from crime and to avoid  
2 generating facilities conducive to crime.

3 *Sutter County*

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

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

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

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

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

15 *Sacramento County*

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

18 Public Facilities Element

19 **Section VI: Sheriff**

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

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

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

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

27 **Section VIII: Energy Facilities**

28 **Objective:** Minimize the health, safety, aesthetic, cultural, and biological  
29 impacts of energy facilities in Sacramento County.

1       **Objective:** Distribute natural gas safely and efficiently, and withdraw  
2       underground gas reserves in an environmentally sensitive manner.

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

7       Housing Element

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

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

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

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

19      *Placer County*

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

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

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

29      **Policy 4.H.4:** The County shall require new development to develop or fund  
30      sheriff facilities that, at a minimum, maintain the above standards.

1           **Goal 4.I:** To protect residents of and visitors to Placer County from injury and  
2           loss of life and to protect property and watershed resources from fires.

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

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

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

13    *City of Roseville*

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

16    Public Facilities Element

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

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

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

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

27    Land Use Element

28          **Policy 2.D:** Develop design guidelines, specifying screening and a transition  
29          between public utilities (e.g. substations, pump stations) and other uses, in  
30          conjunction with the public utility departments and agencies. In addition,

1 development along power line and pipeline easements shall incorporate  
2 design treatment to insure compatibility and safety. Design guidelines and  
3 treatment may include minimum setbacks, building and landscape design  
4 standards and possible limitations on certain types of uses and activities.

5 **4.12.3 Significance Criteria**

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

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

15 **4.12.4 Applicant Proposed Measures**

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

18 **4.12.5 Impact Analysis and Mitigation**

19 **Impact Discussion**

20 The proposed Project would add a new major connection point to the existing Lines  
21 400 and 401 and create a connection between the lower Sacramento Valley's  
22 natural gas transmission system and PG&E's backbone natural gas transmission  
23 system. Additionally, the Project would connect to existing Line 172 and Line 123 to  
24 further reinforce the reliability of the region's natural gas system by providing a  
25 second large-diameter connection point between Lines 400 and 401 and existing  
26 pipelines serving the greater Sacramento Valley region. The purpose of this Project  
27 is to support existing and approved future planned population growth in the Project  
28 area and would not directly or indirectly increase population in the Project area.  
29 Effects on the Project area's population and housing, public services, or utilities and  
30 service systems would coincide with the construction of the pipeline and would  
31 therefore be temporary.

1 *Vacancy Rate*

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

12 Should these workers need temporary housing during the 10-month construction  
13 period, an ample number of hotels and motels are available near the Project area.  
14 Approximately ten lodging establishments are located in Woodland and are within a  
15 reasonable driving distance to the western portion of the pipeline. The Best Western  
16 Shadow Inn, located at 584 North East Street in Woodland, approximately 2.75  
17 miles south of the proposed pipeline, reported that weekday vacancy rates are  
18 typically high but during weekends vacancy rates lower substantially. Within  
19 Natomas, a portion of northern Sacramento, ten hotels are within reasonable driving  
20 distance of the eastern portion of the pipeline. The Holiday Inn Express, located at  
21 2981 Advantage Lane in Natomas, approximately 4 miles south of the proposed  
22 pipeline, reported that weekday vacancy rates usually fluctuate between 45 and 75  
23 percent with periods of no vacancy depending on regional events. A representative  
24 at the Holiday Inn Express indicated that during times of large construction projects,  
25 such as the recent Fix-I-5 project in Downtown Sacramento, hotels in the area work  
26 together to accommodate demand. Construction of the Project may affect the  
27 overall availability of temporary housing. However, due to the short duration of the  
28 Project and the large number of hotels in close proximity to the proposed alignment,  
29 the Project would not cause the vacancy rate for temporary housing to fall below 5  
30 percent. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant (Class III).

31 *Increase Demand for Public Services in Excess of Capacities*

32 The Project would not increase the short- or long-term demand for public services,  
33 utilities, or service systems in excess of existing and projected capacities. Increase  
34 in demand for public services, utilities, or services systems is generally related to  
35 population growth. Since the proposed Project would not result in any permanent

1 population growth, the demand for such services would not increase. Therefore, the  
2 proposed Project would not create long-term increased demand for such services or  
3 necessitate the construction of additional related facilities. Impacts would be less  
4 than significant (Class III).

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

8 *Services*

9 Fire Protection, Emergency Medical Services and Police Protection

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

22 Minor impacts to police response times could be affected indirectly as a result of  
23 traffic associated with construction of the Project. Refer to Section 4.13,  
24 Transportation and Traffic, for further discussion. Routes for emergency vehicles  
25 would be maintained throughout Project construction areas to the maximum extent  
26 feasible. Roadway closures would be coordinated with emergency service providers  
27 as directed by the TMP for the Project (see Applicant Proposed Measure 15-3 in  
28 Section 4.13, Transportation and Traffic). At least one travel lane would be kept  
29 open in areas where the pipeline crosses roadways during construction. Increases  
30 in demand for such services are generally associated with population growth. Since  
31 both Project construction and operation are not expected to directly or indirectly  
32 induce substantial population growth, demand for fire protection and emergency  
33 medical services would not be expected to increase. Therefore, the proposed  
34 Project would not create a permanent increased demand for such services or  
35 necessitate the construction of additional related facilities. Because the majority of

1 the fire stations which serve the proposed pipeline are staffed by volunteer fire  
2 fighters, response times may be longer than those from fully staffed fire stations. As  
3 such, response times to emergencies along the pipeline may be slightly longer.

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

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

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

#### 20 Schools, Parks and Recreation

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

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

1 *Utilities and Service Systems*

2 Project construction would not increase the demand or reduce the availability of  
3 utilities within the Project area. Operation of the pipeline would not create an  
4 increase in population and, therefore, would not increase demand or change existing  
5 levels of utility services. PG&E's projections for their 10-year investment plan  
6 assume an additional 19,890 customers in an area where they are currently serving  
7 675,000 customers. This represents a projected increase of 2.9 percent. However,  
8 this figure is substantially less than the estimated population growth (see Table 4.12-  
9 2) for the counties where the proposed Project would be located. The proposed  
10 Project would accommodate anticipated future population growth, but would not be  
11 growth inducing. Operation and maintenance of the Project would not result in  
12 significant impacts to utilities.

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

16 Electricity and Natural Gas

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

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

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

1 Water and Wastewater

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

11 Overall, hydrostatic testing would use approximately 7.26 million gallons of water  
12 (22.3 acre feet). Specific locations for the discharge of hydrostatic test water have  
13 not yet been determined. Where possible, the test water would be discharged into  
14 trucks and used for dust control. When use of the water as dust control is not  
15 practical, the water would be discharged over land, in agricultural drain ditches or  
16 storm drains, or in sanitary sewers per local permits and ordinances. Such  
17 discharges would use a flow manifold and energy dissipater to control the rate of  
18 discharge and to minimize erosion and turbidity to meet the standards set forth  
19 under the terms and conditions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination  
20 System (NPDES) permit and the General Order for Dewatering and Other Low  
21 Threat Discharges to Surface Waters, issued by the Central Valley Regional Water  
22 Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB). Occurrences of water discharge from  
23 hydrostatic testing would be limited to the period of construction. Impacts would be  
24 less than significant (Class III).

25 Solid Waste and Recycling Service

26 Operation of the proposed Project would not produce any solid waste. Construction  
27 activities are expected to produce a small amount of construction-related waste that  
28 would not adversely affect landfills near the Project area. An approximation of the  
29 amount of waste resulting from Project construction is not yet known. PG&E would  
30 implement solid waste management BMP 2-04 that would insure the proper disposal  
31 and waste diversion measures are completed to the maximum extent feasible. BMP  
32 2-04 contains provisions for site housekeeping, onsite water storage areas, and  
33 drainage management. Local landfills, which have adequate capacity as  
34 demonstrated in Table 4.12-3, would likely be the location of waste disposal. As  
35 such, short-term impacts to waste and recycling services would not be in excess of  
36 existing capacities. Impact would be less than significant (Class III).

1 Underground Utility Lines and/or Facilities

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

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

15 *Population Increase*

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

26 The proposed Project is designed to increase the supply and stability to the existing  
27 gas transmission infrastructure and would not directly connect to homes or  
28 businesses. The proposed pipeline is intended to increase infrastructure that would  
29 serve existing and future planned population growth within the Project area. PG&E's  
30 projections for their 10-year investment plan assume an additional 19,890 customers  
31 in an area where they are currently serving 675,000 customers. This represents a  
32 projected increase of 2.9 percent. However, this figure is substantially less than the  
33 estimated population growth (see Table 4.12-2) for the counties where the proposed  
34 Project would be located. Since PG&E has an obligation to serve public utility  
35 needs, and the Project accommodates existing and approved growth, the Project

1 would not directly induce population growth. No significant permanent impacts to  
2 population are expected to occur as a direct result of this Project. The temporary  
3 relocation of construction workers would not cause a permanent population increase  
4 of 3 percent or more in affected counties. Impacts would be less than significant  
5 (Class III).

## 6 **Displace People**

7 The Project would not displace a large number of people. Construction personnel  
8 from outside the local area are expected to utilize temporary housing such as hotels,  
9 motels, apartments and campgrounds. Table 4.12-3 summarizes the Project area's  
10 housing and vacancy rates. Total housing units in each county range between  
11 33,069 in Sutter County and 545,287 in Sacramento County. Vacancy rates range  
12 between 3.53 percent in Yolo County and 10.82 percent in Placer County. While  
13 construction personnel may temporarily rent housing units, it is more likely that  
14 short-term housing, such as hotels and motels, would be used. The number of local  
15 hotels and motels range from 494 in Placer County to more than 10,000 in  
16 Sacramento County. Vacancy rates in Yolo, Sutter, and Placer Counties are  
17 typically high. Periods of low vacancy rates in Sacramento County could reduce the  
18 number of available rooms to below 1,000. However, this remaining availability is  
19 still above both Sutter and Placer counties' total rooms. According to previous  
20 PG&E pipeline construction documentation, approximately 30 percent of out-of-area  
21 workers would provide their own housing in the form of travel trailers or other  
22 recreation vehicles. After completion of the pipeline, no new employees would be  
23 required for maintenance or operation.

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

## 29 **4.12.6 Impacts of Alternatives**

30 A No Project Alternative as well as twelve options have been proposed for the  
31 alignment in order to minimize or eliminate environmental impacts of the proposed  
32 Project and to respond to comments from nearby landowners. The twelve options,  
33 labeled A through L, have been analyzed in comparison to the portion of the  
34 proposed route that has been avoided as a result of the option. Descriptions of the

1 options can be found in Section 3.0, Alternatives and Cumulative Projects, and are  
2 depicted in Figure 3-2A through 3-2K.

3 **No Project Alternative**

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

7 **Option A**

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

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

22 **Option B**

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

32 Similar to the proposed project, Option B would not result in population growth and  
33 therefore would have less than significant (Class III) impacts to public services.

1 Similar to the proposed project, impacts to utilities and service systems such as  
2 electricity, natural gas, water, wastewater, solid waste, recycling or underground  
3 utility lines and facilities would be less than significant (Class III).

#### 4 **Option C**

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

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

#### 18 **Option D**

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

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

32

1 **Option E**

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

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

15 **Option F**

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

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

29 **Option G**

30 Option G involves a minor location shift and would not change the overall length of  
31 the proposed alignment. Similar to the proposed Project, Option G would not result  
32 in permanent relocation of construction workers. Also similar to the proposed  
33 Project, the maximum number of on-site workers required to construct Option G

1 would not exceed 90 at any given time. As such, Option G would require the same  
2 amount of temporary housing as the proposed Project and would result in less than  
3 significant impacts (Class III) to local vacancy rates. Option G would not result in the  
4 destruction or relocation of any housing or displace a large number of people.

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

#### 10 **Option H**

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

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

#### 24 **Option I**

25 Under Option I, the length of Line 407 E would be increased approximately 2,900  
26 feet. Similar to the proposed Project, Option I would not result in permanent  
27 relocation of construction workers. Also similar to the proposed Project, the  
28 maximum number of on-site workers required to construct Option I would not exceed  
29 90 at any given time. As such, Option I would require the same amount of  
30 temporary housing as the proposed Project and would result in less than significant  
31 impacts (Class III) to local vacancy rates. Option I would not result in the destruction  
32 or relocation of any housing or displace a large number of people.

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

6 **Option J**

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

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

20 **Option K**

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

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

1 **Option L**

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

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

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

Alternative	Comparison with Proposed Project
No Project	No Impacts
Option A	Similar Impact
Option B	Similar Impact
Option C	Similar Impact
Option D	Similar Impact
Option E	Similar Impact
Option F	Similar Impact
Option G	Similar Impact
Option H	Similar Impact
Option I	Similar Impact
Option J	Similar Impact
Option K	Similar Impact
Option L	Similar Impact
Source: Michael Brandman Associates 2009.	

17

1 **4.12.7 Cumulative Projects Impact Analysis**

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

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

12 **Temporary Housing**

13 Should the construction schedules of projects included in the Placer Vineyards  
14 Specific Area Plan or the Sierra Vista Specific Plan coincide, the amount of non-local  
15 construction workers requiring temporary housing and other public services may  
16 increase. The proposed Project's contribution to this cumulative impact would be  
17 temporary in nature as the proposed pipeline's construction period would only last  
18 10 months total (in several phases). In addition, construction workers on the  
19 proposed Project would be spread out along the pipeline and would not necessarily  
20 utilize temporary housing near the Placer Vineyards or Sierra Vista areas. As such,  
21 cumulative impacts to available temporary housing would occur during the length of  
22 time that construction schedules would overlap.

23 **Population Growth**

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

1 to result in growth inducing impacts is discussed in Section 6.0, Other Required  
2 CEQA Sections.

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

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

## 21 **Displace People**

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

## 32 **4.12.8 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

33 This purpose of this Project is to support existing and approved future planned  
34 population growth in the Project vicinity and would not directly or indirectly increase

1 permanent population in the Project area. PG&E's planned increases in natural gas  
2 in Lines 406 and 407 would accommodate demand for anticipated residential and  
3 small commercial entity gas consumption. Average annual gas throughput and  
4 residential demand for gas would both grow at an annual average of about 3  
5 percent. The customers that could be served by the proposed pipeline would not be  
6 solely dependent on the proposed Project for natural gas. Projected new residential  
7 demand that would occur as a result of implementation of the Placer Vineyards and  
8 Sutter Pointe Specific Plans have already been anticipated. As a result, the addition  
9 or lack of natural gas associated with the proposed Project would not likely affect  
10 development in the region.

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

18

19

20

21