

4.11 POPULATION AND HOUSING

4.11.1 Introduction

This section presents existing and projected population and housing at the project site and its vicinity and analyzes the potential for development under the proposed 2014 LRDP to affect those resources. The analysis is based on information in the City of Richmond General Plan 2030, the 2010 US Census, American Community Surveys, and ABAG projections data.

Public and agency NOP comments related to population and housing are summarized below:

- The EIR should analyze the fiscal impacts of RBC site construction, operation, and maintenance (including insurance) on residents of Richmond, Alameda County, and the State of California including financial costs of the project and funding mechanisms that will be used.
- Analyze and plan to minimize local housing impacts from the expected concentration of employment.

All scoping comments were taken into consideration in the EIR analysis. Because the analysis of fiscal impacts is outside the scope of CEQA analysis, those impacts are not discussed in the EIR.

4.11.2 Environmental Setting

This section discusses existing conditions and projections for employment, population, and housing and their relationship to existing and projected conditions for the city and region. The RBC site is in the city of Richmond in Contra Costa County, California. Contra Costa County is part of the larger 9-county Bay Region Economy. The 9-county Bay Region is made up of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma Counties.

Employment and Income

The civilian labor force for the Bay Area was 3,676,415 in 2010 (see Table 4.11-1). Approximately 14 percent of the civilian labor force resides in Contra Costa County. The civilian labor force of the Bay Area decreased by nearly 2 percent between 2000 and 2010 and the unemployment rate increased from 3.4 percent in 2000 to 10.5 percent in 2010 (BLS 2013).

**Table 4.11-1
Bay Area Civilian Labor Force**

	2000	2010
Alameda	769,061	761,264
Contra Costa	500,940	523,315
Marin	141,809	133,128
Napa	66,625	75,734
San Francisco	472,759	456,589
San Mateo	398,171	374,909
Santa Clara	940,731	880,803
Solano	194,209	214,620
Sonoma	253,260	256,053
Bay Area	3,737,565	3,676,415

Source: BLS 2013

Richmond is in western Contra Costa County. In 2010, Contra Costa had 470,495 jobs, a decline of 4.5 percent from 2005. Health care and social assistance, retail trade, and government and government enterprises were Contra Costa's largest employers (BEA 2013a). Health care remains an important Contra Costa County employment source; health care accounted for 11.3 percent of employment and increased 16 percent between 2005 and 2010. The retail sector accounted for more than 10 percent of all jobs in 2010, a decrease of nearly 10 percent from 2005. Government accounted for 10.5 percent of employment in 2010, a slight decrease from 2005. The professional, scientific, and technical services industries are also a key economic sector for Contra Costa County. These account for more than 9 percent of all jobs in 2010, an increase of nearly 2 percent from 2005. The utilities industry had the largest growth in jobs from 2005 with a 59 percent job increase. The construction industry experienced the largest decline from 2005 with a decrease of 33 percent.

In 2010, the Bay Area had 4,312,112 jobs, an increase of 1.8 percent from 2005 (BEA 2013a). The Bay Area is expected to slowly recover the jobs lost during the recent recession and then experience moderate job growth to 2040. The Bay Area is projected to add more than 1.2 million jobs between 2010 and 2040 and is projected to grow slightly faster than California and the U.S. (Levy 2012).

The RBC site currently employs 300 workers. This represents a very small percentage of the total employment in the Bay Area, It is 0.03 percent of employment in Contra Costa County, and 0.3 percent of employment in Richmond.

The Bay Area unemployment rate increased from 3.4 percent in 2000 to 10.5 percent in 2010 (Table 4.11-2). In 2010, unemployment rates in the Bay Area ranged from a low of 8 percent in Marin County to a high of 12 percent in Solano (BLS 2013a). Contra Costa County had an unemployment rate of 11.1 percent and the City of Richmond a rate of 16.7 percent (BLS 2013).

Table 4.11-2
Bay Area Unemployment Rate

Area	2000	2010
Contra Costa	3.6	11.1
Richmond	6.0	16.7
Bay Area	3.4	10.5

Source: BLS 2013

The Bay Area economy has kept up with the state of California in generating income growth. As shown in Table 4.11-3, the Bay Area as a whole has a higher per-capita income than the state of California and the United States. Since 2005, all nine counties in the Bay Area increased in income growth. Marin County had the highest per-capita income in the Bay Area at \$82,498 in 2010. Contra Costa County had a per-capita income of \$54,817. The average salary per job in the Bay Area was \$62,516 and \$59,308 in Contra Costa County in 2010.

Population

According to the City of Richmond General Plan 2030, the City of Richmond grew from 87,425 in 1990 to 99,216 in 2000, The increase of 11,791 residents is an 11.9 percent growth. During this same time, the Bay Area population increased 11.2 percent. The 2005 population of the City of Richmond accounted for 10.1 percent of Contra Costa County's population (City of Richmond 2013).

**Table 4.11-3
Bay Area Per Capita Income**

County/Area	2005 Per Capita Income	2010 Per Capita Income
Alameda	\$44,228	\$47,603
Contra Costa	\$51,585	\$54,817
Marin	\$81,567	\$82,498
Napa	\$45,494	\$48,765
San Francisco	\$64,330	\$69,351
San Mateo	\$63,115	\$66,629
Santa Clara	\$52,457	\$57,433
Solano	\$34,557	\$36,929
Sonoma	\$41,931	\$43,274
Bay Region	\$52,115	\$55,812
California	\$38,731	\$41,893

Source: BEA 2013b

Note: All Per Capita Income dollar amounts presented are in nominal dollars (i.e., current dollars, not adjusted Inflation), as reported by BEA.

In 2010 the City of Richmond had a population of 103,701, an increase of 4.5 percent from 2000. The 2010 population for the Bay Area was 7,152,749, a 5 percent increase from 6,785,760 in 2000. Contra Costa and Napa Counties experienced the largest population growth in the Bay Area between 2000 and 2010 with an increase of 10.6 percent in Contra Costa County and 9.8 percent in Napa County. San Mateo County experienced the lowest growth with an increase of 1.6 percent in the same time (ABAG 2013).

Santa Clara County has the largest population in the Bay Area with a 2010 population of 1,781,642. Napa County is the smallest county with a population of 136,484 in 2010. Population forecasts by the California Department of Finance indicate continuous population growth for most of the Bay Area. As shown in Table 4.11-4, Contra Costa County is projected to have continuous strong growth through 2040 with a growth rate between 9 and 11 percent.

**Table 4.11-4
Bay Area Historic and Projected Population**

County/Area	2000	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050
Alameda	1,443,741	1,510,271	1,608,204	1,657,567	1,678,565	1,684,761
Contra Costa	948,816	1,049,025	1,147,399	1,254,205	1,392,509	1,489,068
Marin	247,289	252,409	251,361	253,026	259,549	264,810
Napa	124,279	136,484	145,660	158,649	172,927	185,238
San Francisco	776,733	805,235	852,788	877,847	891,607	907,443
San Mateo	707,161	718,451	747,563	803,288	850,112	895,603
Santa Clara	1,682,585	1,781,642	1,889,898	1,986,545	2,083,710	2,152,199
Solano	394,542	413,344	447,217	493,422	551,491	592,850
Sonoma	458,614	483,878	507,250	534,439	572,664	598,795
Bay Area	6,785,760	7,150,739	7,599,360	8,021,018	8,455,174	8,772,817

Source: ABAG 2013; DOF 2013

The population at the RBC site consists of UC Berkeley researchers and employees and guests who use the RBC facilities occasionally or work there on a temporary basis collaborating with other scientists and engineers. Guests are not LBNL employees; most are employed by other institutions, businesses, or government agencies. As of late 2012, the RBC site has a daily population of approximately 300.

Based on the places of residences presented in the 2004 UC Berkeley LRDP and the 2006 LBNL LRDP, it is assumed that RBC site employees reside throughout the Bay Area with a majority (90 percent) living in Alameda and Contra Costa counties. Applying that assumption to 2010 county population data, RBC site employees residing in Alameda and Contra Costa counties would constitute approximately 0.01 percent of the counties' populations. RBC site employees and their dependents (assuming an average household size of 2.77) would represent approximately 0.04 percent of the total population of Alameda and Contra Costa counties.

Housing

According to the City of Richmond General Plan 2030, the housing supply in the Bay Area region continues to grow. Between 1990 and 2000, Contra Costa County and the Bay Area had increases of 12.7 percent and 8.9 percent, respectively. Housing growth continued through 2005. Housing growth at a regional level slowed considerably, but Contra Costa County continues to build more homes (City of Richmond 2013).

In 2000, the City of Richmond had approximately 34,625 housing units, representing a 5.4 percent increase from the 32,749 units in 1990. Between 2000 and 2005, the City of Richmond's housing supply grew by 2.4 percent to 35,475 housing units (City of Richmond 2013).

The Bay Area housing characteristics are summarized in Table 4.11-5, which identifies owner-occupied and renter-occupied homes, along with median home values for each Bay Area county. The housing units in Table 4.11-5 include all structure types (e.g., single-family homes, apartments, and mobile homes). Santa Clara accounts for 22.7 percent of the housing units in the Bay Area and Contra Costa County accounts for 14.4 percent. The City of Richmond accounts for 1.4 percent of the Bay Area housing units and 9.8 percent of the housing units in Contra Costa County. The median home value ranges from \$32,100 in Solano County to \$839,100 in Marin County. Contra Costa County had a median home value of \$467,200 and the City of Richmond had a median home value of \$339,200 (Census 2013b).

**Table 4.11-5
Bay Area 2010 Housing Characteristics**

County/Area	Total Housing Units	Occupied Housing Units	Owner Occupied Units	Renter Occupied Units	Vacant Units	Median Home Value
City of Richmond	39,328	36,093	18,659	17,434	3,235	\$339,200
Alameda	582,549	545,138	291,242	253,896	37,411	\$543,100
Contra Costa	400,263	375,364	251,904	123,460	24,899	\$467,200
Marin	111,214	103,210	64,637	38,573	8,004	\$839,100
Napa	54,759	48,876	30,597	18,279	5,883	\$495,900
San Francisco	376,942	345,811	123,646	222,165	31,131	\$773,600
San Mateo	271,031	257,837	153,110	104,727	13,194	\$756,400
Santa Clara	631,920	604,204	348,298	255,906	27,716	\$674,100
Solano	152,698	141,758	89,648	52,110	10,940	\$32,100
Sonoma	204,572	185,825	112,280	73,545	18,747	\$458,600
Bay Area	2,785,948	2,608,023	1,465,362	1,142,661	177,925	\$543,100

Source: Census 2013a; Census 2013b

4.11.3 Regulatory Considerations

Federal

There are no federal laws or regulations regarding population and housing relevant to the proposed 2014 LRDP.

State

There are no state laws or regulations regarding population and housing relevant to the proposed 2014 LRDP.

Local

The RBC site is University-owned property where work within the University's mission is performed on land owned or controlled by The Regents. As a state entity, the University is exempt under the state constitution from compliance with local land use regulations, including general plans and zoning. The University seeks to cooperate with local jurisdictions to reduce the physical consequences of potential land use conflicts to the extent feasible. The RBC site is in the City of Richmond. The following sections summarize objectives and policies from the City of Richmond General Plan 2030 as they relate to population and housing.

City of Richmond General Plan

The City of Richmond 2030 General Plan – Economic Development, Land Use and Urban Design, Community Health and Wellness (City of Richmond 2012) has these goals, policies, and actions related to population and housing:

GOAL ED1: An Appealing Place to Live and Work. Foster neighborhoods, commercial and industrial areas and public spaces that are safe and welcoming environments to live, work and visit. Effective public safety services, neighborhood revitalization effort, opportunities for cultural and recreational activities, affordable housing, socially and environmentally responsible businesses and a diverse and expanded tax base will contribute to this environment.

The following policy is outlined in relation to Goal ED1:

- **Policy ED1.5 A Range of Housing Types.** Continue to require developers to provide a range of housing types and residential densities to meet the needs of all age groups, income levels, and household sizes.

GOAL ED2: Quality Jobs and Revenue. Create an attractive business environment that will support business recruitment, expansion and retention. Attract a variety of small and large firms, national and local establishments, and up-and-coming industries and employers across a variety of economic sectors. Offer a broad range of quality employment opportunities for current and future residents with varying degrees of experience, education and training.

The following policy is outlined in relation to Goal ED2:

- **Policy ED2.4 – Existing Employers:** Encourage established employers to remain and expand in Richmond in order to retain employers in key industries including green businesses, high-technology firms, food-related companies, port-related industries, medical services, manufacturing and distribution and retail/entertainment.

GOAL LU3: Expand Economic Opportunities. Expand economic opportunities in existing commercial and industrial areas and develop new opportunities to diversify the local economy. Create an attractive and socially-responsible business environment that will support business

recruitment, expansion and retention. Encourage innovative, high-growth and green business, and further support business and industries in providing a range of job and entrepreneurial opportunities while minimizing environmental and health impacts.

The following policy is outlined in relation to Goal LU3:

- **Policy LU3.2 – Local Employment Base.** Expand and diversify the local employment base to provide quality jobs for Richmond residents.

GOAL HW5: A Range of Quality and Affordable Housing. Promote stable and integrated communities and healthy living conditions for all residents by continuing to support projects that provide high quality, affordable housing. Well-designed, affordable and well-maintained housing contributes to: neighborhood stability; greater socioeconomic integration; reduced overcrowding; and improved living conditions for all.

The following policies are outlined in relation to Goal HW5:

- **Policy HW5.1 – Housing for All Income Levels.** Maintain the availability of an adequate supply of quality housing units to meet the needs of all income levels and continue to encourage development of additional quality and affordable housing units.
- **Policy HW5.2 – A Range of Housing Types.** Support and encourage development of a range of housing types that meet the needs of a broad range of population groups including seniors, large and small families, low and middle-income households and people of all abilities.

GOAL HW6: Expanded Economic Opportunity. Promote equitable access to economic opportunities that provide the material and social means for human development and upward mobility in the community.

The following policy is outlined in relation to Goal HW6:

- **Policy HW6.1 – Local Employment Base.** Expand and diversify the local employment base to provide quality jobs for Richmond residents.

The 2030 General Plan EIR states that population and job opportunities would increase, resulting in a need for more housing units. The General Plan assumes the addition of housing and jobs in Richmond. The increase in population and job opportunities are not considered physical environmental effects themselves, but environmental impacts of both are analyzed in the appropriate technical section of the City of Richmond General Plan EIR (City of Richmond 2011b). The City of Richmond General Plan EIR assumed that the City of Richmond would capture 13 percent of Contra Costa County’s projected population growth of 231,900, resulting in an increase of 30,147 people in the City of Richmond by 2030. The EIR assumed an increase of 22,488 jobs in the City of Richmond by 2030 (City of Richmond 2011b). Growth projections in the General Plan EIR are “aggressive in that they far exceed the past growth in the City and also exceed the growth projected in the City by the Association of Bay Area Governments” (City of Richmond 2011b). The General Plan EIR notes that while growth is an intended consequence of the General Plan, it potentially impacts traffic, air quality, habitat and wildlife, utilities and services. The Final EIR states that the City of Richmond will track the number of new housing units and jobs in the city, to determine if either exceeds projected General Plan levels; if so, an update to the General Plan and EIR would be prepared.

4.11.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Standards of Significance

The impacts on population and housing from the implementation of the 2014 LRDP would be considered significant if they would exceed the following Standards of Significance, in accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines* and the UC CEQA Handbook:

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

CEQA Checklist Items Adequately Addressed in the Initial Study

The analysis in the Initial Study prepared for the project and circulated with the NOP concluded that further analysis of the following issues was not required in the EIR.

- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

The RBC site does not include housing or any related residential uses, and no housing would be displaced, so no impact would occur, and no additional analysis is required.

Analytical Methods

City and regional baseline data on population, housing, and employment were obtained primarily from the 2000 Census, the 2010 Census, and ABAG's *Projections 2009*.

The section assesses the anticipated RBC-related employment increase in relation to the population and housing policies and projections for the City of Richmond and the Bay Area region. Project-related employment growth and housing demand would occur over several decades. A portion of future RBC-related site employees are assumed to be existing LBNL or UC Berkeley employees whose place of work would be moved to the new campus. Another portion of the employees would be new hires, most of whom are expected to be from within the Bay Area.

RBC 2014 LRDP Policies

The RBC 2014 LRDP policies related to population and housing include the following:

- SP1 – Safety and Preparedness Policy on Model Programs: Develop model environment, health, and safety programs for the RBC.
 - Develop comprehensive and effective physical safety, life safety, and emergency service plans to protect the environment, the public, employees, and guests at all times.
- SP2 – Safety and Preparedness Policy on Inclusion: Ensure that the RBC contributes to and serves as a resource for the Richmond Community.

- Expand partnerships with local agencies, including fire and police departments, as well as local neighborhoods to promote understanding and address safety and security concerns of neighbors as well as the campus workforce.

LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures

LRDP Impact POP-1: Development under the 2014 LRDP would incrementally increase the RBC site population over the LRDP's approximately 40-year planning period, but would not induce substantial population growth. (*Less than Significant*)

Under the proposed 2014 LRDP, RBC site population would increase as the RBC site is developed over the approximately 40-year planning period. At full implementation of the LRDP, it is estimated that the RBC site population would increase from 300 in 2012 to 10,000 in 2050, an increase of 9,700.

There would be beneficial economic impacts related to the RBC population growth including increased local commercial activity and sales taxes; a larger RBC population also would generate additional indirect income in supporting industries.

Many of the additional 9,700 RBC site employees are expected to be existing UC employees relocating from other sites. A substantial number would likely be hired from the Bay Area's labor force. Assuming future RBC employees would make the same residential location decisions as current RBC site employees, approximately 90 percent or 8,730 RBC employees would live in Contra Costa and Alameda counties by the year 2050. This population would represent less than 1 percent of the total number of people projected to be living in Contra Costa and Alameda counties in 2050. In all other counties of residence, RBC employees and their associated household population would account for less than 0.05 percent of the total projected population in 2050. Therefore the project-related increase in local population would cause a less than significant impact.

Conservatively assuming that all 9,700 employees are new to the Bay Area, the total population growth from full RBC 2014 LRDP development could add up to 26,869 new persons (RBC employees plus dependents, assuming an average household size of 2.77 for Contra Costa County). The addition of 26,869 to the Bay Area would not alter the regional population significantly. The regional population is projected to grow by about 1.6 million from 2010 to 2050. Growth directly resulting from the 2014 LRDP would amount to less than 1 percent of this increment, so the project-related increase in regional population would cause a less than significant impact.

The increase in permanent employees would add residential population to the City of Richmond, other nearby communities, and the region and could increase demand for permanent housing. Between 2010 and 2040, ABAG projects an increase of approximately 635,650 households in the Bay Area. Approximately 38 percent of the regional total is projected for Alameda and Contra Costa counties, where most RBC employees would likely live.

The housing demand associated with 2014 LRDP permanent employment growth likely would be satisfied by the housing that could be added in Contra Costa and Alameda counties and other nearby communities. The most recent draft forecast for 2010-2040 is the Jobs-Housing Connections Strategy (ABAG 2012) that projects the addition of 83,970 households in Contra Costa County between 2010 and 2040, 160,160 households in Alameda County, and 10,990 households in the City of Richmond. As noted above, the City of Richmond General Plan EIR

assumed an increase in households within the city of more than 30,000 people by 2030 (City of Richmond 2011b). Conservatively assuming that all 9,700 employees are new to the Bay Area and 90 percent of those would live in Contra Costa or Alameda counties, the 2014 LRDP would cause an 8,730-household increase in Contra Costa and Alameda counties by 2050. This would represent a small percentage of the total additional households projected for these counties. Similarly, a portion of those households would be established in the City of Richmond in Contra Costa County—this likely would also represent a small portion of total new households anticipated. Therefore, the project-related impact due to increased employee housing demand would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measure is required.

Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

LRDP Cumulative Impact POP-1: **Development under the 2014 LRDP together with cumulative regional development would induce population growth in the City of Richmond and the Bay Area, but the contribution of the 2014 LRDP to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable. (*Less than Significant*)**

The geographic context for cumulative population and housing impacts analysis includes the nine-county Bay Area. While the employment increase would be concentrated at the RBC site, this impact on residential population growth would be dispersed throughout the Bay Area and would be spread out over 40 years.

The 2014 LRDP is expected to add 9,700 employees to the RBC site by 2050. These new employees would induce additional population growth as they would generate new employee households. Conservatively assuming all these new employees would reside in the Bay Area, the 2014 LRDP could add 26,869 new persons (RBC employees plus dependents, assuming an average household size of 2.77 for Contra Costa County). The addition of 26,869 to the Bay Area would not alter regional population significantly. Regional population is projected to grow by about 1.6 million from 2010 to 2050. Growth directly resulting from the 2014 LRDP would amount to less than one percent of this increment.

The expected population growth from 2014 LRDP development would be a component of overall expected Bay Area growth. Altogether, this future population growth would add to existing population and housing totals. This future growth could be accommodated through new development and in occupancy changes in existing housing and other building space. While the projected growth of the Bay Area population through 2040 could have environmental impacts, particularly to the extent it induces new development at the fringes of urbanized areas, the contribution of the 2014 LRDP to these potential impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measure is required.

4.11.5 References

ABAG (Association of Bay Area Governments). 2012. *Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy*. Revised May 16.

_____. 2013. Selected Census data from the San Francisco Bay Area. <http://www.bayareacensus.ca.gov/>.

- BEA (Bureau of Economic Analysis). 2013a. CA25N Total Full-time and part-time employment by NAICS industry.
<http://bea.gov/iTable/iTable.cfm?reqid=70&step=1&isuri=1&acrdrn=5#reqid=70&step=1&isuri=1>.
- _____. 2013b. CA1-3 Personal income summary.
<http://bea.gov/iTable/iTable.cfm?reqid=70&step=1&isuri=1&acrdrn=5#reqid=70&step=1&isuri=1>.
- _____. 2013c. CA34 Wage and salary summary,
<http://bea.gov/iTable/iTable.cfm?reqid=70&step=1&isuri=1&acrdrn=5#reqid=70&step=1&isuri=1>.
- BLS (Bureau of Labor Statistics). 2013. Local Area Unemployment Statistics.
<http://www.bls.gov/data/>
- Census (US Census). 2013a. B25077 Median Value (Dollars) Universe: Owner-occupied housing units 2008-2010 American Community Survey 3-year Estimates.
<http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>.
- _____. 2013b. DP-1 Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010, 2010 Demographic Profile Data. <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>.
- City of Richmond. 2011. *Richmond General Plan 2030*. August 2011.
- _____. 2011b. *City of Richmond General Plan EIR*, February 2013.
- DOF (California Department of Finance). 2013. Total Population Projections for California and Counties: July 1, 2015 to 2060 in 5-year Increments. January 2103.
- Levy, Stephen. 2012. Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy, *Bay Area Job Growth to 2040, Projections and Analysis*, February 2012.
- University of California. 2013. Richmond Bay Campus Long Range Development Plan, Community Draft. August 12, 2013.