

# Chapter 16—Population and Housing

---

## 16.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the existing conditions and potential project-related impacts to population and housing from the proposed project. The project will not significantly impact the regional or local population, nor will it require the displacement of existing housing.

### 16.1.1 Methodology

Demographic and economic data were obtained from literature searches, statistical reports from the State of California Department of Finance, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, the State of California Employment Development Department (EDD), and from personal communications with state and local government personnel.

## 16.2 Existing Conditions

### 16.2.1 Population

As of January 1999, the State of California Department of Finance estimated Alameda County's population at 1,433,300, approximately four percent of the population of California. The City of Pleasanton accounted for approximately four percent (64,300) of Alameda County's population, while the City of Livermore contributed approximately five percent (73,600) to Alameda County's population. Since 1990, Alameda County's population has increased by approximately 154,118 residents; Pleasanton's population increased by approximately 13,747 residents; and Livermore's population increased by approximately 16,859 residents.

In January 1999, Contra Costa County's population was estimated at 916,400, approximately three percent of California's population. Contra Costa County's population has increased by 112,668 residents since 1990.

Forecasts by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG, 1998) project that Contra Costa and Alameda Counties will be among the top three counties to lead the region in numerical population, job, and household growth between 1995 and 2020. By the year 2020, Alameda County's population is expected to reach 1,793,139, while Contra Costa County's population is projected to reach 1,104,725. Table 16-1 summarizes the overall population totals for the Tri-Valley area from the 1990 census totals and the January 1999 estimates and provides the projected percent increase in population.

**TABLE 16-1**  
Tri-Valley Area Population Totals

City/County	1990 Census Total	January 1999 Estimates	Projected Percentage Increase
Alameda County	1,279,182	1,433,300	11.2
Contra Costa County	803,732	916,400	11.4
Livermore	56,741	73,600	12.9
Pleasanton	50,553	64,300	12.7

Source: ABAG, 1998.

## 16.2.2 Housing

As of January 1998, Alameda County had approximately 525,417 total housing units and a 5.04 percent vacancy rate. The City of Pleasanton had a 4.51 percent vacancy rate and approximately 22,698 total housing units in January 1998. The City of Livermore had a 3.94 percent vacancy rate and a total of 25,166 housing units in January 1998. Over half the total housing units in Alameda County are single detached homes. Likewise, the majority of housing units in both Pleasanton and Livermore are also single detached homes.

In January 1998, Contra Costa County recorded a vacancy rate of 5.07 percent with a total of 346,695 housing units. About 65 percent of the housing units in Contra Costa County are single detached homes. Housing data for the Tri-Valley Area is summarized in Table 16-2.

**TABLE 16-2**  
Tri-Valley Area January 1998 Total Housing Units and Vacancy Rate

City/County	Total Housing Units	Percent Vacant
Alameda County	525,417	5.04
Contra Costa County	346,695	5.07
Livermore	25,166	3.94
Pleasanton	22,698	4.51

Source: ABAG, 1998.

## 16.2.3 Temporary Housing

Due to the urban nature of the Tri-Valley Area, there are numerous visitor accommodations in the project vicinity with approximately 3,100 hotel rooms capable of supporting transient workers.

## 16.2.4 Employment and Income

According to the April 1999 EDD Labor Force Data, based on the number of laborers in each jurisdiction, the total number of people employed in Alameda County was 697,700, with an unemployment rate of 3.5 percent. Pleasanton's employment was approximately 32,880, with an unemployment rate of 1.8 percent. Livermore's employment was approximately 34,310, with an unemployment rate of 2.4 percent.

Contra Costa County's employment in April 1999 was 474,800 with an unemployment rate of 3.1 percent. Total employment figures and unemployment rates for the Tri-Valley Area are summarized in Table 16-3.

EDD reported in April 1999 that jobs in the service producing industry (that is, hotels, retail, trade, etc.) made up the majority of the labor force in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. A summary of ABAG's projections in 1998 indicated that this pattern will continue over the next few years with more jobs added to the service sector than to any other job sector.

ABAG has projected that the Cities of Livermore, Pleasanton, and Dublin will add 86,570 jobs between 1995 and 2020, an increase of 107 percent over 1995.

**TABLE 16-3**  
Tri-Valley Area 1998 Total Employment Figures and Unemployment Rate

City/County	Total Employment (number of laborers)	Unemployment Rate (%)
Alameda County	697,700	3.5
Contra Costa County	474,800	3.1
Livermore	34,310	2.4
Pleasanton	32,880	1.8

Source: State of California Employment Development Department, 1999.

According to ABAG, 1998, the mean household income for Alameda County in 1995 was \$58,800. That same year, Pleasanton had a mean household income of \$87,700, and Livermore had a mean household income of \$69,300. Contra Costa County's mean household income was \$70,700.

ABAG's projections for the year 2000 estimate that the mean household income of Alameda County will reach \$65,100. Mean household income in Pleasanton is estimated to reach \$96,300, and Livermore's mean household income is expected to reach \$75,800. The 2000 projections anticipate that Contra Costa County will have a mean household income of \$79,000. Table 16-4 summarizes the 1995 and 2000 mean household income figures for the Tri-Valley Area.

**TABLE 16-4**  
Tri-Valley Area 1995 and 2000 Mean Household Income Figures

City/County	1995	2000 Projections
Alameda County	\$58,800	\$ 65,100
Contra Costa County	\$70,700	\$ 79,000
Livermore	\$69,300	\$ 75,800
Pleasanton	\$87,700	\$ 96,300

Source: ABAG, 1998.

## 16.2.5 North Area—Phase 1

### Transmission Line

Phase 1 of the North Area is located in northern Alameda County, near the Contra Costa County line. The land consists mainly of undeveloped agricultural and grazing land, with a few scattered residences throughout the area. There is a barn located in PG&E's existing easement on Collier Canyon Road between Mileposts B14.7 and B14.8.

### Substations

The Dublin Substation site is located on grazing land in an unincorporated area of Contra Costa County. The North Livermore Substation site is located west of North Livermore Road on vacant grazing land. There are currently no structures on either substation site.

## 16.2.6 North Area—Phase 2

The North Area Phase 2 transmission line route is located primarily on undeveloped agricultural and grazing land in northern Alameda County, with only a few scattered residences nearby. No major structures exist in this portion of the project area. The land from the Tesla Substation to Milepost B10.4 is mostly vacant with scattered wind farms throughout the area. This remote area of Alameda County contains a few dispersed residences.

## 16.2.7 South Area

The South Area transmission line would pass through mostly vacant and grazing land. However, from Milepost M0 to M5.5, the line would be placed under city streets along Hearst Drive and Bernal Avenue until it terminates in the Vineyard Substation. Approximately 30 houses and a neighborhood recreational facility are located along Hearst Drive. A community park, a business, and approximately 40 residences are located along Bernal Avenue.

## 16.3 Potential Impacts

### 16.3.1 Significance Criteria

The significance criteria listed below were derived from Appendix G of the revised CEQA Guidelines. Impacts to population and housing in the project area would be considered significant if the project:

- Displaced a large number of existing residences causing the construction of replacement housing elsewhere
- Displaced a substantial number of people causing the construction of replacement housing elsewhere
- Induced substantial population growth in the project area either directly or indirectly

### 16.3.2 Construction Impacts

Construction activities will occur at various locations along the transmission line routes and substation sites over approximately 12 months. During construction, PG&E will employ a peak total of approximately 60 to 70 workers, most likely from the local labor force.

**Impact 16.1.** If local laborers are used, there will be no increase in demand for housing by the project. However, if a non-local labor force is employed, a temporary need for accommodations will arise. This will result in a less than significant impact due to the numerous hotel/motel accommodations serving the project area and the relatively small number of people drawn to these accommodations.

#### North Area—Phase 1

**Impact 16.2.** A portion of the transmission line between Mileposts B14.7 and B14.8 will be constructed over an existing barn on Collier Canyon Road. However, because the barn will not be displaced and is not used for human habitation, the impact would be less than significant.

#### North Area—Phase 2

**Impact 16.3.** No buildings or people will be permanently displaced due to construction of the transmission line because none are present in the right of way. In addition, the project will not cause an increase in population or a demand for housing.

#### South Area

**Impact 16.4.** The project will not permanently displace any residences or people, and will not induce population growth in the Tri-Valley area (see Chapter 18, Growth-Inducing and Cumulative Impacts).

### 16.3.3 Operation Impacts

**Impact 16.5.** Because the project will not displace people or existing housing and will not create population growth, impacts will be less than significant.

## 16.4 Mitigation Measures

Because no significant population and housing impacts will result from construction or operation of project facilities, mitigation measures are not required.

## 16.5 References

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). 1998. *A Summary of Projections '98 Findings*.

ABAG. 1997. *Projections '98*. December.

City of Livermore. 1999. *City Profile*.

City of Pleasanton. 1998. *Community Profile*.

State of California Employment Development Department (EDD). 1999. Labor Force Data for Sub-county Areas, Alameda County. April.

EDD. 1999. Labor Force Data for Sub-county Areas, Contra Costa County. April.

EDD. 1998. Labor Force and Industry Employment, Oakland MSA (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties). March.

EDD. 1999. Oakland PMSA Current Month Descriptive Narrative (Press Release), Oakland Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. May 14.

State of California Department of Finance (DOF). 1998. County Population Projections with Race/Ethnic Detail.

DOF. 1999. Report E-1 City/County Population Estimates with Annual Percent Change. January 1.

DOF, Demographic Research Unit. 1998. Table 1: County/State Population and Housing Estimates. January 1.

Portlock, Lolinda. Tri-Valley Convention & Visitor's Bureau. 1999. Personal communication with D. Slanina. June 7.

U.S. Census Bureau, American FactFinder. 1999. Population and Housing—1990 Census Detailed Tables—100% Data (STF1).

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). 1998. Table 2: City/County Population and Housing Estimates. January 1.

Casey, Tammy. HUD. 1999. Personal communication with D. Slanina. June 4.