

5.14 Population and Housing

This section provides a description of population and housing for the Proposed Project area, and evaluates potential impacts associated with implementation of the Proposed Project and alternatives. Population and housing data and projections were obtained from the California Department of Finance (CDOF) and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

5.14.1 Setting

Population

The Proposed Project and alternatives would be located within unincorporated Ventura County (the county) and the cities of Moorpark and Thousand Oaks. Ventura County is located in southern California, west of Los Angeles County. Over the past three decades, Ventura County has experienced steady growth. The county's population increased by approximately 21 percent in the 1980's, from 529,174 in 1980 to 669,016 in 1990 (CDOF, 2013). The 2000 population estimate was 753,197 persons, which further increased the population by approximately 11 percent. The county grew an additional 8 percent between 2000 and 2010, reaching an estimated 823,318 residents (CDOF, 2013). The incorporated cities of Moorpark and Thousand Oaks followed similar or greater population growth trends within the same time period.

Table 5.14-1, 2014 Population Estimates in the Proposed Project Area, shows 2014 population estimates for Ventura County and the cities of Moorpark and Thousand Oaks.

**TABLE 5.14-1
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES IN THE PROPOSED PROJECT AREA**

Population	Ventura County	City of Moorpark	City of Thousand Oaks
Total Population in 2014	842,967	35,172	129,039

SOURCE: CDOF, 2014.

Table 5.14-2, Historic and Projected Population Growth in the Proposed Project Area, shows historic and projected population growth in the Proposed Project area from 1980 to 2035; as demonstrated in the table, the populations in Ventura County and the cities of Moorpark and Thousand Oaks are expected to increase over the next 20 years.

Housing

According to the CDOF, at the beginning of 2014, Ventura County had an estimated 284,489 total housing units with a vacancy rate of approximately 5.1 percent and the vacancy rates in the cities of Moorpark and Thousand Oaks were 2.4 percent and 3.5 percent, respectively (CDOF, 2014). 2014 housing data for Ventura County and the cities of Moorpark and Thousand Oaks are shown in **Table 5.14-3, 2014 Housing Data Estimates in the Proposed Project Area**.

**TABLE 5.14-2
 HISTORIC AND PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH IN THE PROPOSED PROJECT AREA**

Area	1980	1990	% Change 1980–1990	2000	% Change 1990–2000	2010	% Change 2000–2010	2020	% Change 2010–2020	2035	% Change 2015–2035
Ventura County	529,174	669,016	21	753,197	11	823,318	8	889,000	7	954,000	9
Moorpark	n.a.	25,494	n.a.	31,415	18	34,421	9	39,300	12	41,500	5
Thousand Oaks	77,072	104,352	26	117,005	11	126,683	7	129,700	2	130,900	.9

NOTES: n.a. = information not available. (The City of Moorpark was incorporated in 1983.)

SOURCES: CDOF, 2013; SCAG, 2012.

**TABLE 5.14-3
 2014 HOUSING DATA ESTIMATES IN THE PROPOSED PROJECT AREA**

Area	Total Housing Units	Occupied Housing Units	Vacant Housing Units	Vacancy Rate (percent)
Ventura County	284,489	269,896	14,593	5.1
Moorpark	10,835	10,578	257	2.4
Thousand Oaks	47,788	46,117	1,671	3.5

SOURCE: CDOF, 2014.

As demonstrated in **Table 5.14-4, Household Estimates: 2008 to 2035**, the number of households in the cities of Moorpark and Thousand Oaks and in Ventura County is forecast to increase between 2008 and 2035 (SCAG, 2012).

**TABLE 5.14-4
 HOUSEHOLD ESTIMATES: 2008 TO 2035**

Year	Ventura County	Moorpark	Thousand Oaks
2008	266,000	10,400	45,600
2020	292,000	12,000	46,100
2035	318,000	12,700	46,600

SOURCE: SCAG, 2012.

Regulatory Setting

Federal

No federal regulations pertaining to population and housing apply to the Proposed Project or alternatives.

State

Southern California Association of Governments

SCAG is a Joint Powers Agency established under California Government Code Section 6502 et seq. SCAG is designated as a Council of Governments, a Regional Transportation Planning Agency, and a Metropolitan Planning Organization for a six-county region that includes Ventura County. SCAG prepares a Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the region, which defines the housing need allocation for each member local government in Southern California. The most recently published RHNA covered the planning period of January 1, 2006, to June 30, 2014. The RHNA is a key tool for SCAG and its member governments to plan for growth (SCAG, 2014).

Local

California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) General Order No. 131-D explains that local land use regulations would not apply to the Proposed Project. However, for informational purposes, the goals and policies of local general plans and other planning documents pertaining to population and housing that would otherwise be relevant to the Proposed Project and alternatives are described below.

Ventura County General Plan

The following goals and policies identified in the Public Facilities and Services Element of the Ventura County General Plan would be relevant to the Proposed Project and alternatives (Ventura County, 2007):

Goal 4.1.1.1: Plan for public facilities and services which will adequately serve the existing and future residents of the County.

Goal 4.5.1: Promote the efficient distribution of public utility facilities and transmission lines to assure that public utilities are adequate to service existing and projected land uses, avoid hazards and are compatible with the natural and human resources.

City of Moorpark General Plan

The City of Moorpark General Plan does not include any applicable goals, objectives, or policies related to population and housing that would be relevant to the Proposed Project or alternatives (City of Moorpark, Various Dates).

City of Thousand Oaks General Plan

The City of Thousand Oaks General Plan does not include any applicable goals, objectives, or policies related to population and housing that would be relevant to the Proposed Project or alternatives (City of Thousand Oaks, 2001).

5.14.2 Significance Criteria

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would result in significant population and housing-related effects on the environment if it would:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure);
- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or
- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

5.14.3 Applicant Proposed Measures

No applicant proposed measures have been identified by Southern California Edison (SCE) to reduce Proposed Project impacts associated with population and housing.

5.14.4 Impact Analysis

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly.

Impact 5.14-1: Construction could indirectly induce population growth. *Less than significant* (Class III)

The Proposed Project does not include new homes or businesses, and so would not directly induce substantial temporary or permanent population growth in the area. Accordingly, the Proposed Project would have no direct impact on population growth inducement.

The Proposed Project could have an indirect impact on population growth in the area if it encouraged people to move to the area to obtain construction employment. During the approximately 10-month construction period, up to 217 construction workers per day could be employed during the peak of construction. Construction would be performed by either SCE construction crews or contractors. It is anticipated that all temporary positions would be filled from the local labor pool available in Ventura County, with workers expected to commute to the site rather than relocate. This could result in some need for temporary accommodation during construction, for instance, if workers were to engage in “weekly commuting” (staying in the local area during the work week and returning home on weekends). However, there are numerous hotels and motels near the Proposed Project alignment to accommodate the need. Proposed Project operation and maintenance would be handled by current SCE employees. No new permanent jobs would be created. Therefore, overall, employment generated by the Proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact on population growth because any short-term lodging demand created during construction could be accommodated by existing units and no long-term growth would result from operation of the Proposed Project. Therefore,

implementation of the Proposed Project would not be expected to result in any significant increase to the local population or adverse effect on the housing market.

The Proposed Project also could have an indirect impact on population growth if it would extend infrastructure into the area that could accommodate growth. The Proposed Project is designed to allow SCE to continue to provide reliable electrical service in its electric needs area (ENA) (see Figure 3-2, *Electrical Needs Area*, in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, for an illustration of the ENA), and to meet forecasted demand. The Proposed Project's improvement in the reliability of electrical services is consistent with development anticipated by local plans and expected population growth. Furthermore, the availability of electrical capacity by itself does not normally induce growth within a particular area. Other factors such as economic conditions, land availability, population trends, availability of water supply or sewer services, and local planning policies have a more direct effect on growth. Accordingly, the Proposed Project would have a less-than-significant indirect impact on population growth associated with extension of infrastructure.

Mitigation: None required.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. (No Impact)

The Proposed Project would be constructed within existing rights-of-way (ROWs), easements, public ROWs, and on existing SCE "fee-owned" property (i.e., property which is currently legally owned by SCE) (SCE, 2014). The Proposed Project alignment generally traverses open space and agricultural areas. Other improvements would occur at the Moorpark and Newbury substations. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not displace any residential housing units. Therefore, the Proposed Project would have no impact with regard to the displacement of existing housing units, nor would it necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. (No Impact)

As noted above, the Proposed Project would not displace any housing; it also would not displace people or any other structures that are occupied by people. Therefore, the Proposed Project would have no impact associated with the displacement of people or the construction of replacement housing.

5.14.5 Alternatives

No Project Alternative 1

Under No Project Alternative 1, the Proposed Project would not be constructed; therefore, there would be no impact related to population and housing. Future demand in the ENA would not be adequately met. While this would jeopardize SCE's ability to provide reliable electric service to customers within the ENA, it would not result in impacts associated with population and housing (No Impact).

No Project Alternative 2

Under No Project Alternative 2, the Proposed Project would not be constructed and all of the infrastructure already constructed for the Moorpark-Newbury 66 kV Subtransmission line would be removed, with the exception of the previously installed LWS poles and energized conductor. Impacts associated with construction-period employment under No Project Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the Proposed Project because this alternative would require a similar construction workforce to remove previously constructed infrastructure. All removal of infrastructure would occur within the same existing SCE ROW, easements, fee-owned property, and public ROW as the Proposed Project. Future demand in the ENA would not be adequately met. Accordingly, No Project Alternative 2 would have a less-than-significant indirect impact on population growth related to temporary construction employment (Class III) and no impact related to directly inducing population growth, indirectly inducing population growth through the extension of electrical infrastructure, and the displacement of existing housing or people (No Impact).

References – Population and Housing

California Department of Finance (CDOF), 2013. Historical Census Populations of Counties and Incorporated Cities in California, 1850–2010, updated March 2013. Available at: http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/state_census_data_center/historical_census_1850-2010/view.php, accessed October 20, 2014.

CDOF, 2014. Table 1: E-5: State/County Population and Housing Estimates. Available at: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-5/2011-20/view.php>, accessed October 20, 2014.

City of Moorpark, (Various Dates). City of Moorpark General Plan. (Housing Element amended January 15, 2014, Noise amended 1998; Land Use last amended June 17, 2009; Safety adopted March 2001; Circulation adopted May 13, 1992; Open Space Element adopted August 4, 1986)

City of Thousand Oaks, 2001. *Thousand Oaks General Plan Goals, Policies and Implementation Measures*, adopted December 22, 1970; amended January 9, 2001.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), 2012. Adopted 2012 RTP Growth Forecast. Available at:
<http://gisdata.scag.ca.gov/Pages/SocioEconomicLibrary.aspx?keyword=Forecasting>, accessed October 20, 2014.

SCAG, 2014. Southern California Association of Governments: About Us, and Regional Housing Needs Assessment. Available at: <http://scag.ca.gov/about/Pages/Home.aspx>, accessed October 20, 2014.

Southern California Edison (SCE), 2014. Data Request Response 2. DATA REQUEST SET A1310021 Moorpark-Newbury-ED-SCE-02, August 15, 2014, and Supplemental Responses submitted on October 7.

Ventura County, (Various dates) Ventura County General Plan. (Hazards and Land Use Appendices amended October 22, 2013; Resources Appendices [AQ, Water, Bio, Energy, Paleo, Scenic, Ag, etc.] and Goals/Policies last amended June 28, 2011; Public Facilities amended May 8, 2007).

This page intentionally left blank