

14.0 POPULATION AND HOUSING

This chapter describes the existing population and housing characteristics in the City of Pittsburg (City) and Contra Costa County (County), and analyzes the potential effects on population and housing that may occur with the implementation of the proposed project.

Guidelines and key sources of data used in the preparation of this chapter include the following:

- U.S. Census Bureau *American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate, 2005-2009*¹
- Contra Costa County employment profile
- *City of Pittsburg General Plan* Housing Element
- City of Pittsburg Bay Area Census summary highlighting 2010 U.S. Census Data and 2000 U.S. Census Data

14.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

14.1.1 Regulatory Context

There are no population or housing regulations specifically applicable to the population and housing analysis in this Environmental Impact Report.

14.1.2 Existing Conditions

The proposed project is located at 696 West 10th Street in the City of Pittsburg in Contra Costa County, approximately 32 miles northeast of Oakland and along the shores of Suisun Bay (refer to Figure 2-1: Project Location Map in Chapter 2.0: Proposed Project and Alternatives). The project would occupy an existing marine and storage terminal on an industrial site, which is currently inactive, and would modernize and reactivate the site for transfer and storage of crude oil and partially refined crude oil, to be known as the WesPac Energy-Pittsburg Terminal (Terminal). The proposed Rail Transload Operations Facility (Rail Transload Facility) would be constructed on approximately 9.8 acres of currently vacant land within an existing rail yard to be leased from BNSF Railway Company (BNSF). The property is located between the existing BNSF and Union Pacific Railroad rail lines along the north side of North Parkside Drive between Magnolia Court and Jimno Avenue. This section describes the existing economic and

¹American Community Survey estimates are based on data collected over a five-year time period. The estimates represent the average characteristics of population and housing between January 2005 and December 2009 and do not represent a single point in time.

demographic characteristics of the project area, including population, housing, and employment.

14.1.2.1 Population

The total population of Contra Costa County was approximately 1,049,000 in 2010, up from approximately 948,800 in 2000 (ABAG, 2010b). Pittsburg is the fifth largest of 19 cities in the County. In 2010, the total population of the City was approximately 63,300, up from 56,800 in 2000 (ABAG, 2010a). The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) estimated that the City's population will reach up to 71,000 by 2020 and up to 78,100 by 2030. This represents an average growth rate of 1.5 percent per year. Although the rate of population growth is estimated to slow slightly, growth in the City is predicted to outpace that of the County (City of Pittsburg, 2009).

The population within a 6-mile radius of the project site was approximately 176,000 in 2000 (CEC, 2008). The census tracts in which the project is located (3141.02, 3141.03, and 3090) extend beyond the project site westward and eastward, and were home to approximately 14,240 residents in 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010).

14.1.2.2 Housing Characteristics

Based on 2010 data, there are approximately 21,130 housing units in the City of Pittsburg. Of those units, approximately 92 percent are occupied and approximately 8 percent are vacant. Of the occupied housing units, approximately 59 percent are owner occupied and approximately 41 percent are renter occupied. The average household size is approximately 3.22 individuals per unit (ABAG, 2010a).

From 2000 to 2008, approximately 2,500 new homes were added to the City's housing stock. During this time, the housing stock in Pittsburg increased annually by a slightly higher rate (1.5 percent) than the County (1.4 percent), but much more slowly than in east Contra Costa County (3.5 percent). A greater proportion of single-family homes were built in the City during this period (92 percent) than the County in general (81 percent). In addition, much of Pittsburg's housing stock was younger than County housing stock in general; approximately 49 percent of all housing units in Pittsburg were constructed after 1980, compared to 59 percent throughout the County (City of Pittsburg, 2009).

According to ABAG's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), the City needs to provide 1,772 affordable housing units between 2007 and 2014, with 322 of these units for extremely low- or very low-income households, 223 for low-income households, and 296 for moderate-income households. Since January 1, 2007, a total of 570 affordable housing units (32 percent of the total RHNA need) have been approved (City of Pittsburg, 2009).

14.1.2.3 Employment and Income

The City of Pittsburg has an overall jobs-housing imbalance because the vast majority of residents commute to jobs outside the City. According to the City's general plan, only 19 percent of employed Pittsburg residents work within the City, and on average the mean travel time to work is approximately 35 minutes (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009). The California Employment Development Department's Monthly Labor Force Data for Cities and Census Designated Places reported that in July 2011 the total labor force in the County was approximately 520,400 individuals, of which approximately 11 percent were unemployed. For the City, the total labor force was approximately 30,600 individuals, of which approximately 17.3 percent were unemployed.

Compared to the County, Pittsburg has a larger share of manufacturing, wholesale, and transportation jobs, which normally require more vocational training and less formal education (City of Pittsburg, 2009). Large employers in Pittsburg are the school district, USS-POSCO Industries, and Dow Chemical Company. ABAG (2010a) projected employment in the City to more than double by 2030, with approximately 19,000 new jobs anticipated. From 2005 to 2030, Pittsburg's employment growth is projected to outpace the County's employment growth, at an annual average rate of 2.9 percent for the City and 1.5 percent for the County.

According to the *American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate, 2005-2009*, the median household income was approximately \$57,700², the median family income was approximately \$63,570², and the per capita income was approximately \$22,131². Through the period of 2005 through 2009, approximately 9.8 percent of Pittsburg residents were living below the poverty level, and approximately 12.9 percent of individuals were living below the poverty level (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009).

14.2 IMPACT ANALYSIS

14.2.1 Methodology for Impact Analysis

Demographic, economic, and geographic data was mostly gathered from the U.S. Census Bureau, ABAG, City of Pittsburg, and California Employment Development Department through website searches and online publicly available information, as referenced in Section 14.3.

²2009 inflation-adjusted dollars

14.2.2 Significance Criteria

For the purposes of this analysis, an impact was considered to be significant and to require mitigation if it would result in any of the following:

- Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)
- Significantly change population, employment, or housing
- Displace a substantial number of people or existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere

14.2.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

14.2.3.1 Proposed Project

Construction-related Impacts

Impact Population and Housing (PH)-1: Induce substantial population growth in the City of Pittsburg and/or Contra Costa County, either directly or indirectly, as a result of project construction. (Less than significant.) The proposed project involves the modernization and reactivation of an existing marine terminal, storage terminal, and existing and new associated pipelines, as well as construction of a new Rail Transload Facility. The proposed project would not involve the construction of new homes, businesses, roads, or other infrastructure that may directly or indirectly influence population growth in the surrounding project area. Construction labor required for the project would mostly come from local contractors within 20 to 30 miles of the project site. While supplemental labor may be needed for project construction, outside labor sources would be utilized minimally and on an as-needed, temporary basis. Population increases resulting from the need for construction workers in the area would be very minor and temporary, if at all, and would not exceed projected/planned growth levels for the City and/or the County; therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-2: Significantly change population and employment in the City of Pittsburg and/or Contra Costa County resulting from construction. (Less than significant.) The proposed project would generate temporary employment during the construction period. A total of approximately 295 construction personnel would be employed during peak phases of the project. During marine terminal construction, a maximum workforce of approximately 25 workers would be needed. During storage terminal construction, there would be a maximum workforce of approximately 225 workers. During pipeline construction, a maximum workforce of approximately 25 workers would be needed. During Rail

Transload Facility construction, a maximum workforce of approximately 20 workers would be needed. As phases of the work are completed, the workforce at the Terminal would gradually decline, as would the associated temporary employment opportunities. The job benefit during the construction timeframe would total approximately 295 direct jobs.

The capital cost of the proposed project, including the marine terminal, storage terminal, and associated pipelines, is estimated to be approximately \$200 million. Associated construction expenditures would result in secondary increases in employment related to purchases from materials supply firms and their suppliers, referred to collectively as indirect employment. According to the Contra Costa Building and Construction Trade Council, an indirect benefit of construction labor is a factor of 7 to 10 indirect jobs for every one direct job. This suggests that that a maximum of 2,950 indirect jobs would result from construction of the project. Materials purchases would be made locally, when feasible. When not available locally, specialty equipment and materials may require purchase from specialty equipment suppliers outside the City. Nevertheless, the indirect workforce would mostly come from within the City of Pittsburg and extended Contra Costa County.

Given the size of the existing workforce within the City (30,600 people with approximately 17.3 percent unemployment) and the minimal number of temporary jobs during project construction (295 direct and 2,950 indirect jobs), the proposed project would not result in migration to the region or cause adverse physical changes to the environment. Employment opportunities generated by construction of the project would not exceed the projected/planned levels for the City, as these jobs could be filled by unemployed members of the existing regional workforce (approximately 5,300 people are available for employment in the City). Therefore; potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-3: Changes to housing in the City of Pittsburg and/or Contra Costa County. (Less than significant.) The proposed project would not involve the construction of new homes, businesses, roads, or other infrastructure, which may directly or indirectly yield additional housing development. In addition, construction of the proposed project would not increase the need for additional housing units in the area. As previously mentioned, the majority of construction labor and indirect suppliers would come from local sources within 20 to 30 miles of the project site. Increases in housing needs or associated public housing services for construction workers in the area would be minor and temporary, if at all, and would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-4: Displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere as a result of construction. (No impact.) The proposed project site is an existing inactive marine and storage terminal and proposed construction would involve modernizing and reactivating the associated existing facilities, as well as construction of a Rail Transload Facility. Project construction would not displace any existing residences or businesses, necessitating the construction or replacement of housing or development elsewhere. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Operational Impacts

Impact PH-5: Physical impact (e.g., dilapidation of housing or other facilities) arising from economic effect resulting from project operation. (Less than significant.) While it is not anticipated that the proposed project would reduce nearby property values, it is possible that nearby property values could be impacted as a result of the reactivation of the existing facility should existing homeowners decide to relocate out of the City of Pittsburgh. However, while it is reasonable to anticipate that some existing homeowners may decide to relocate as a result of the reactivation and operation of the existing Terminal, it is not reasonable nor foreseeable to anticipate that these homes would be left unoccupied, resulting in a physical change (such as dilapidation of existing housing) or a potential significant impact to the environment. Nearby waterfront property has been developed and actively used for other industrial purposes such as the NRG Energy, Inc. (NRG) Pittsburgh Generating Station, USS-POSCO, Dow Chemical, K2 Pure Solutions, United Spiral Pipe, and the Delta Diablo Wastewater Treatment Plant (among others), and nearby residential communities have remained intact. Of these examples, the NRG Pittsburgh Generating Station (located west of and adjacent to the proposed project) exists 500 feet west of residential communities and United Spiral Pipe is located adjacent to residential communities. Other examples, including NRG Pittsburgh Generating Station, USS-POSCO, Dow Chemical, K2 Pure Solutions, and the Delta Diablo Wastewater Treatment Plant, are all located within 1 mile of residential communities and other sensitive receptors (e.g., schools or churches). Residential communities have remained active in these areas, and no precedent has been established to indicate that development for industrial purposes may directly or indirectly correlate to physical changes to the environment.

In addition, while the environmental analysis uses the assumption that every vessel demanding a location to unload its cargo in northern California would be received at the new Terminal facility, competition would continue among other marine oil terminals to bring in oil imports. For the analysis of most physical environmental resources, this assumption helps to provide a conservative analysis of reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts. However, in the case of population impacts, it is important to consider that it is possible that the Terminal

may gain existing market share from other existing terminals in northern California that currently receive crude oil. If this were to occur, it is not foreseeable that effects on the existing terminals would result in physical effects to the environment (e.g., from non-operation or deterioration of facilities) because these facilities could be used in other ways; for example, for refined products, specialty products, spot market, or contract arrangements with specific customers. Therefore, potential impacts would be considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-6: Increase or decrease employment opportunities in the City of Pittsburg and/or Contra Costa County as a result of project operations. (Less than significant.) The proposed project is estimated to create approximately 40 full-time direct jobs, which include jobs associated with the Rail Transload Facility operations, Terminal operations, maintenance, and inspection. In addition, linkages among economic sectors would result in the creation of approximately 280 to 400 indirect jobs in related sectors (7 to 10 indirect jobs estimated for every one direct job), for a total of approximately 320 to 440 jobs. Terminal and Rail Transload Facility operators, maintenance staff, and indirect suppliers would mostly come from local sources. Employment opportunities generated by project operations would not exceed the projected/planned levels for the City given the size and nature of the regional economy relative to the number of workers associated with proposed project operations. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-7: Changes to housing in the City of Pittsburg and/or Contra Costa County. (Less than significant.) Operation of the proposed project would not increase the need for additional housing units in the area. As previously mentioned, Terminal and Rail Transload Facility operators would come from local contractors. Increases in housing needs or associated public housing services for operations and maintenance personnel would be minor, and would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-8: Induce substantial population growth in the City of Pittsburg and/or Contra Costa County, either directly or indirectly, as a result of project operations. (Less than significant.) As discussed under Impact PH-6, increases in direct and indirect employment are expected to result in minimal migration to or within the region, given the size and nature of the regional economy relative to the number of workers associated with proposed project operations. Operations employment (i.e., direct, indirect, and induced employment) for the proposed project would represent a negligible portion of regional employment: anywhere from 320 to 440 workers, compared to more than

half a million workers in the County. Therefore, operation of the project would not cause substantial population growth, directly or indirectly, that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-9: Displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere as a result of project operations. (No impact.) As discussed in Impact PH-4, the proposed project site is an existing inactive marine and storage terminal, and operations would not displace any existing residences or businesses. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

14.2.3.2 Alternative 1: Reduced Onshore Storage Capacity

Construction-related Impacts

Impact PH-10: Induce substantial population growth in the City of Pittsburg and/or Contra Costa County, either directly or indirectly, as a result of project construction. (Less than significant.) Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 1 would not involve the construction of new homes, businesses, roads, or other infrastructure, which may directly or indirectly influence population growth in the surrounding area. Construction labor required for the project would mostly come from local contractors (within 20 to 30 miles of the project site). Population increases resulting from the need for construction workers in the area would be very minor and temporary, if at all, and would not exceed projected/planned growth levels for the City and/or County; therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-11: Significantly change population or employment in the City of Pittsburg and/or Contra Costa County resulting from construction. (Less than significant.) Alternative 1 would generate temporary employment during the construction period—anticipated to be shorter than the construction period required for the proposed project. Under this alternative, it is anticipated that fewer construction personnel would be required for storage terminal construction than for the proposed project (estimated to be 225 workers), as the facility would be reduced to exclude six existing tanks and associated tank infrastructure. Marine terminal construction would require a maximum workforce of approximately 25 workers, pipeline construction would require a maximum of approximately 25 workers and Rail Transload Facility construction would require a maximum workforce of approximately 20 workers. The job benefit during the construction timeframe would be less than that of the proposed project. Alternative 1 would

have a smaller capital cost than the proposed project; therefore, less secondary increase in employment would result.

As with the proposed project, given the size of the existing workforce within the City (30,600 people with approximately 17.3 percent unemployment) and the minimal number of temporary jobs during project construction, Alternative 1 would not result in migration to the region or cause adverse physical changes to the environment. Employment opportunities generated by construction would not exceed the projected/planned levels for the City, as these jobs could be filled by unemployed members of the existing regional workforce. Therefore; potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-12: Changes to housing in the City of Pittsburg and/or Contra Costa County. (Less than significant.) Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 1 would not involve the construction of new homes, businesses, roads, or other infrastructure that may directly or indirectly yield additional housing development. Construction of the project under this alternative would not increase the need for additional housing units in the area, as the majority of construction labor and indirect suppliers would come from local sources. Increases in housing needs or associated public housing services for construction workers in the area would be minor and temporary, if at all, and would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-13: Displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere as a result of construction. (No impact.) Project construction would not displace any existing residences or businesses, necessitating the construction or replacement of housing or developments elsewhere. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Operational Impacts

Impact PH-14: Physical impact (e.g., dilapidation of housing or other facilities) arising from economic effect resulting from project operation. (Less than significant.) As discussed under Impact PH-5, it is not anticipated that the reactivation and modernization of existing infrastructure for the project would reduce nearby property values leading to physical impacts to the environment. However, any possible impacts to nearby property values resulting from existing homeowners deciding to relocate out of the City would likely be reduced under Alternative 1, as the closest homeowners would be approximately 500 feet from the project (versus 160 feet under the proposed project). Impacts arising from

economic effects resulting from project operation would be considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-15: Increase or decrease employment opportunities in the City of Pittsburg and/or Contra Costa County as a result of project operations. (Less than significant.) Alternative 1 would require the same number of permanent employees as the proposed project for the operation of the Terminal (40 permanent direct jobs and 280 to 400 indirect jobs in related sectors). Terminal operators, maintenance staff, and indirect suppliers would mostly come from local sources. Employment opportunities generated by Terminal operations would not exceed the projected/planned levels for the City. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-16: Changes to housing in the City of Pittsburg and/or Contra Costa County. (Less than significant.) Similar to the proposed project, operation of Alternative 1 would not increase the need for additional housing units in the area. Terminal operators would come from local contractors. Increases in housing needs or associated public housing services for operations and maintenance personnel would be minor and would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-17: Induce substantial population growth in the City of Pittsburg and/or Contra Costa County, either directly or indirectly, as a result of project operation. (Less than significant.) Increases in direct and indirect employment are expected to result in minimal migration to or within the region, given the size and nature of the regional economy relative to the number of workers associated with operations under Alternative 1. Therefore, operation of the project under Alternative 1 would not cause substantial population growth, directly or indirectly, that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-18: Displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere as a result of project operations. (No impact.) As with the proposed project, operations under Alternative 1 would not displace any existing residences or businesses. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

14.2.3.3 Alternative 2: No Project

Impact PH-19: Induce substantial population growth in the City of Pittsburg and/or Contra Costa County, either directly or indirectly, as a result of project construction. (No impact.) Alternative 2 would not involve the construction of new homes, businesses, roads, or other infrastructure, or generate any additional temporary or permanent employment opportunities other than those already existing for regular maintenance of the existing marine and storage terminals. Therefore, no population growth would occur as a result of Alternative 2.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-20: Impact employment in the City of Pittsburg and/or Contra Costa County resulting from construction. (No impact.) Alternative 2 would not generate any additional temporary or permanent employment opportunities related to construction or operation, and would only necessitate existing maintenance jobs for regular maintenance activities.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-21: Changes to housing in the City of Pittsburg and/or Contra Costa County. (No impact.) Under Alternative 2, no additional employment opportunities would be generated, necessitating the need for additional housing. No temporary or permanent increases in population would be anticipated; therefore, no incremental demand for housing would occur.

In addition, while it is possible that undeveloped land zoned Residential located adjacent to the Terminal—east of the South Tank Farm and south of the East Tank Farm—may be more desirable for housing development under Alternative 2, it is not reasonable nor foreseeable that the implementation of this alternative would impact the decision of developers to move forward with future expansion of residential home development.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-22: Displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere as a result of construction. (No impact.) Under Alternative 2 the facilities would remain as they stand. No construction would occur, and subsequently, construction would not displace any existing residences or businesses, necessitating the construction or replacement of housing elsewhere.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

Impact PH-23: Physical impact arising from economic effect resulting from the No Project Alternative. (No impact.) Alternative 2 assumes that existing maintenance activities would be carried out by NRG, and the facility would be kept in a condition similar to the existing conditions, whereby facilities would not rust or become dilapidated. It is not foreseeable that leaving the existing facilities in a status similar to their existing condition would have any impact on nearby property values.

In addition, it is assumed that existing vessels would continue to visit other existing marine storage and transfer terminals in northern California, which would not result in economic impacts to those existing facilities and their associated physical environments.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation required.

14.3 REFERENCES

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). 2010a. *Bay Area Census: City of Pittsburg*. Online: <http://www.bayareacensus.ca.gov/cities/Pittsburg.htm>. Site visited September 1, 2011.

_____. 2010b. *Bay Area Census: Contra Costa County*. Online: <http://www.bayareacensus.ca.gov/counties/ContraCostaCounty.htm>. Site visited September 1, 2011.

California Employment Development Department. 2011. *Contra Costa County Profile*. Online: <http://www.labormarketinfo.eddd.ca.gov>. Site visited August 31, 2011.

California Energy Commission (CEC). 2008. *Willow Pass Generating Station AFC Socioeconomics*. Online: http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/willowpass/documents/applicant/afc/Volume_01/. Site visited September 12, 2011.

City of Pittsburg. 2009. *General Plan Housing Element*. Online: <http://www.ci.pittsburg.ca.us/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=3783>. Site visited August 31, 2011.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2010. *2010 Demographic Profile – CA - Contra Costa County – Census Tract 3090, CA - Contra Costa County – Census Tract 3141.03, and CA - Contra Costa County – Census Tract 3141.02*. Online: <http://www.census.gov/popfinder/>. Site visited September 12, 2011.

_____. 2009. *American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate, 2005-2009*. Online: <http://www.factfinder.census.gov>. Site visited August 31, 2011.