

## 4.2 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the proposal:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## SETTING

### Regional Setting

#### *San Luis Obispo County*

San Luis Obispo is located on the California central coast between San Francisco and Los Angeles. The county has doubled in population from 1970 to 1990. Due to its central location between the second and fourth largest urban economies in the country (the Los Angeles metropolitan area and the San Francisco Bay Area, respectively), San Luis Obispo County is a fast-growing region with higher population and economic growth rates, but similar income levels as compared to the rest of California. One-third of all homes in San Luis Obispo County have been built between 1980 and 1990. In 1990, the County had a population of 217,162 and 90,200 households. As of 1990, the county had a lower unemployment rate (five percent) than the state (seven percent).

San Luis Obispo County comprises a number of small, coastal communities. Historically, the county's economic base has consisted of agricultural, fishing and energy industries, but the county also depends upon tourism and retirement communities.

#### *Monterey Bay Area*

Monterey County is located south of Santa Cruz County, west of San Benito County and east of the Pacific Ocean. It is one of three counties that comprise the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). The 1990 U.S. Census reports that the Monterey Bay Area had 355,660 residents and 112,965 occupied households. According to the 1990 U.S. Census,

approximately eight percent of the county's residents were unemployed, which was slightly higher than the state's unemployment rate of seven percent. Monterey County has experienced average population growth rates and income levels in comparison to California as a whole.

Monterey County's regional economy is dominated by agriculture, with a mixture of tourism, recreational and commercial boating and fishing, and the industrial, commercial, and residential areas of Salinas and the Monterey Peninsula. The recent conversion of Fort Ord provided opportunities for a growing educational/research-based economy with provisions for a full range of housing opportunities.

### ***Alameda County***

Alameda County is situated west and south of Contra Costa County, east of the San Francisco Bay and north of Santa Clara County. Located in the urbanized western portion of the county, Oakland is the largest city in Alameda County. In 1990, the city had a population of 372,240. As compared to Alameda County, Oakland has a lower median household income and a higher unemployment rate. The median rent and mortgage costs are also lower than the county as a whole. Only seven percent of homes have been built between 1980 and 1990, as compared to 15 percent for the County.

Over the past several decades, the Bay Area has been transitioning from a manufacturing to a service based economy. Furthermore, the regional economy is tied to the high-technology sector, which continues to evolve. While computer and microchip manufacturing have been important during past decades, the region is now seeing the emergence of computer networking equipment and software development. Military base closures have also had a substantial effect on the region, especially for East Bay counties such as Alameda. Tourism, travel, trade, and financial and business services are also prominent sectors of the Oakland economy. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) provides population and housing projections for the nine county San Francisco Bay Area region, including Alameda County.

## **Local Setting**

### ***Morro Bay***

According to the 1990 U.S. Census, the City of Morro Bay had 9,800 residents. On average, residents of Morro Bay are older than residents of San Luis Obispo County (42 years versus 33 years). In 1990, there were 5,700 housing units in Morro Bay. Roughly two-thirds of these units were single-family. Even though 80% of the housing units were occupied and over one-half of the units were owner-occupied, these percentages were still lower than the rest of San Luis Obispo County.

### *Moss Landing*

There are approximately 6,029 residents in the vicinity of the power plant. Of a total of 1,735 housing units reported in the 1990 Census, 95% were occupied and 62% of occupied units were owner-occupied.

### *Oakland*

Based on the 1990 U.S. Census, Oakland had 372,240 residents. It is a built-out urbanized area which has a higher unemployment rate and lower median household income than Alameda County and the rest of the state. There are 7,080 residents in the vicinity of the Oakland Power Plant. Of the 3,110 housing units in the area, 86% are occupied and 87% are rental units. As a comparison, within the City of Oakland, 93% of residential units are occupied and 58% are rental units.

## **CHECKLIST ISSUES**

### **a) Population Projections**

#### *Local Issues*

#### **Morro Bay**

Morro Bay had a population of 9,800 in 1990, which declined by two percent to 9,220 in 1995. According to the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG), the population of Morro Bay will be 10,030 in the year 2005, an increase of nine percent from 1995.

The Morro Bay power plant has 114 employees, of which about one-fifth are management. As a comparison, Morro Bay has 4,520 employed residents and the County has 97,420 total employed residents.

The California Coastal Commission places building restrictions in coastal cities such as Morro Bay. Furthermore, due to the rapid rate of population growth in the county over the past 20 years, the community generally supports slow growth measures. Given these development constraints, if a new owner were to modify the power plant, it is unlikely that the site would generate a notable impact on population growth. In any event, it is projected that the plant would continue to operate in its present form, possibly at a higher capacity factor, which would not affect population growth. Thus, the divestiture of this plant would have a less-than-significant impact on local and regional population growth.

## **Moss Landing**

As of 1995, there were 5,870 residents in the vicinity of the Moss Landing power plant, an increase of four percent since 1990. According to the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), the local population will increase by 13% to 6,630 in the year 2005.

The Moss Landing power plant employs 119 people, one-third of which are management employees. As a comparison, there are 2,475 employed residents in the community of Moss Landing, and 146,885 total employed residents in the County.

The Moss Landing plant is needed for system reliability purposes and has been designated by PG&E as a “must-run” facility. If the plant were modified this would not have a substantial effect on local and regional population growth. In any event, it is projected that the plant would continue to operate in its present form, merely at a higher capacity factor, which would not affect population growth. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on population growth.

## **Oakland**

As of 1995, there were 7,045 residents in the vicinity of the Oakland power plant, a decrease of one-half of one percent since 1990. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) projects an increase of 21%, to 8,526 residents in the year 2005.

The Oakland power plant has no full time employees assigned to it. Two employees from the Hunters Point power plant maintain and operate the Oakland plant. As a result of the sale of the Oakland plant separately from the Hunters Point facility, new employees could be permanently assigned to the Oakland plant. Such minimal new jobs would not substantially affect population growth.

The Oakland power plant presently runs at a very low capacity, serving as a backup facility during peak periods. Nevertheless, it has been designated as a “must-run” facility for system reliability. Even if the plant were modified it is unlikely that it would have a substantial effect on local and regional population growth. In any event, it is projected that the plant would continue to operate in its present form, possibly at a higher level, which would not affect population growth. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact.

## ***Conclusion***

Operation of the three PG&E power plants by new owners, even at higher levels, would not have a substantial effect on local and regional population growth. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on local and regional population growth.

## **b) Growth Inducement**

### *Local Issues*

#### **Morro Bay**

The Morro Bay power plant is located in a developed area. Its continued operation as a power plant is unlikely to induce substantial growth, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial growth in the area, either directly or indirectly, and would have a less-than-significant impact.

#### **Moss Landing**

The Moss Landing power plant is located in a developed area. Its continued operation as a power plant is unlikely to induce substantial growth, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial growth in the area, either directly or indirectly, and would have a less-than-significant impact.

#### **Oakland**

The Oakland power plant is located in an area that has already been developed. Its continued operation as a power plant is unlikely to induce substantial growth, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial growth in the area and would have a less-than-significant impact.

### *Conclusion*

The three PG&E power plants are located in heavily developed areas. It is unlikely that their continued operations, even with higher capacity factors, would induce substantial growth, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact.

## **c) Existing Housing**

### *Local Issues*

#### **Morro Bay**

Northeast of the power plant is a camping/recreational vehicle park on PG&E property. It is possible that a number of fixed-income residents live on this site on a long-term basis. This property is leased to the City of Morro Bay by PG&E. The terms and conditions of the current lease will be conveyed by PG&E to the new owner. At the end of the current lease term, PG&E can renew the lease to the City of Morro bay under the same terms and conditions, renegotiate it or terminate it. The new owner would have the same options under the same schedule. The

options with respect to the lease will not change with divestiture. Therefore, there is a less-than-significant impact.

### **Moss Landing**

No residential units have been identified on the Moss Landing power plant site. Thus, no existing housing would be displaced and the project would have a less-than-significant impact.

### **Oakland**

No residential units have been identified on the Oakland power plant site. Thus, no existing housing would be displaced and the project would have a less-than-significant impact.

### ***Conclusion***

The three PG&E power plants are located in heavily developed areas. Their continued operations under the project would not displace existing housing. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact.