

3.2 POPULATION AND HOUSING

This section discusses the possible effects the project could have on the availability of temporary and permanent local housing in Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties. The analysis includes examining housing issues both during construction, when an estimated 50–60 workers would need temporary housing, and during operations.

3.2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed project alignment passes through largely rural, unincorporated areas of northern San Joaquin County and southern Sacramento County. Nearby cities include Lodi, Galt, and Isleton.

POPULATION

Since 1990, the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valley regions have undergone rapid population growth because of better than average economic conditions and relatively low housing prices.

San Joaquin County's population increased by approximately 13 percent between 1990 and 1998, slightly more than the state as a whole during the same period (Table 3.2-1). Much of this population growth occurred in urban areas. Within San Joaquin County, the cities of Lodi and Stockton have also grown steadily over the past 8 years: Lodi by 7 percent and Stockton by 14 percent. In 1998, 24 percent of the county's 542,200 residents lived in the incorporated parts of the county.

Similar to San Joaquin County, Sacramento County underwent steady growth over the past 8 years. The county's population increased by approximately 12 percent between 1990 and 1998 (Table 3.2-1). Within the county, the City of Sacramento's population increased by 7 percent and Galt's population increased by 88 percent. Lower housing costs, a less crowded environment, proximity to the greater Sacramento metropolitan area, and relatively small size accounted for Galt's significantly high rate of population increase.

HOUSING

Population growth in San Joaquin County has spurred increased housing development. The county's 1998 housing stock is shown in Table 3.2-2. Approximately 5 percent of the county's 184,238 housing units were vacant in 1998. Housing vacancy rates were slightly lower in Lodi (3.4 percent) and slightly higher in Stockton (5.2 percent) during the same year. During 1998, the median price for a single-family residential unit in San Joaquin County was \$117,500 and the average monthly rental rate for a two-bedroom apartment was \$550 (California Department of Finance 1999).

3.2 Population and Housing

TABLE 3.2-1
POPULATION GROWTH IN SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COUNTIES, 1990–1998

Geographic Area	1990 (a)	1998 (b)	Percent Change, 1990–1998
State of California	29,760,000	33,251,800	12
San Joaquin County	480,628	542,200	13
Lodi	51,874	55,700	7
Stockton	210,943	241,100	14
Sacramento County	1,031,500	1,159,800	12
Galt	8,889	16,700	88
Sacramento	366,500	392,800	7

(a) Source: California Department of Finance, 1998.

(b) Source: California Department of Finance, 1999.

Sacramento County had 461,027 housing units in January 1998 (Table 3.2-2). Vacancy rates were slightly higher in Sacramento County than in San Joaquin County; approximately 5.8 percent of the county's housing units were vacant. Housing vacancy rates were slightly lower in Galt (5.3 percent) and approximately the same in Sacramento (5.82 percent) during the same year. During 1998, the median price for a single-family residential unit in Sacramento County was \$125,000 and the average monthly rental rate for a two-bedroom apartment was \$582 (California Department of Finance 1999).

3.2.2 REGULATORY SETTING

No local, state, or federal goals, objectives, or policies are considered relevant to the potential population and housing effects of the LGS project.

3.2.3 SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Criteria for determining the significance of population and housing impacts were developed based on questions contained in the environmental checklist form in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines.

3.2 Population and Housing

Based on the checklist questions, a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it would result in:

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

TABLE 3.2-2
HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS OF SAN JOAQUIN AND SACRAMENTO COUNTIES, 1998

Geographic Area	Total Units	Single-Family Units	Multifamily Units	Percent Vacant	Persons per Household
San Joaquin County	184,238	132,748	42,324	4.94	3.02
Lodi	20,774	14,004	6,271	3.43	2.68
Stockton	80,207	51,724	27,154	5.15	3.11
Sacramento County	461,027	315,448	130,631	5.80	2.62
Galt	5,758	4,667	708	5.31	3.03
Sacramento	161,054	104,294	53,317	5.82	2.53

Source: California Department of Finance, 1998.

3.2.4 IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND MITIGATION MEASURES

METHODOLOGY

This impact analysis focuses on the direct change in population and direct increase in the demand for housing that would be attributable to the proposed project. Unless otherwise noted, the methodology is the same for the analysis of alternatives. Data and assumptions provided by LGS were used in conjunction with baseline data provided by the California Department of Finance. Direct construction employment estimates for the proposed project were provided by LGS and reflect the following assumptions:

3.2 Population and Housing

- Construction-related activities are estimated by LGS to last approximately 4-5 months.
- Approximately 190–230 construction workers are anticipated to work on the proposed project (e.g., pipeline, separation facilities, and compressor facilities).
- Approximately 140–170 workers (75 percent) would be hired locally (within commute distance).
- Approximately 50–60 workers (25 percent) would be considered non-local and would require housing during the 4- to 5-month construction period.

Galt and Lodi are the most likely housing locations for non-local construction workers. However, Stockton and Sacramento are also close enough to provide housing for non-local workers. Table 3.2-3 presents the number of available hotel and motel rooms and the distances to the project sites from the surrounding communities. Assuming that non-local construction workers would share rooms (2 people to a room), an estimated 25–30 rooms would need to be available for these workers within the surrounding communities during the 4- to 5-month construction period estimated by LGS.

During the period of highest occupancy (June–October), the occupancy rate for hotel and motel rooms is commonly 90 percent. Under worst-case conditions, if construction occurs during this period, approximately 54 rooms are estimated to remain available within 10 miles of the compressor or separation facility project sites. During other periods, occupancy rates are commonly lower and more rooms would be available.

**TABLE 3.2-3
HOTEL AND MOTEL ROOMS IN THE PROJECT AREA**

Geographic Area	Number of Rooms	Distance to Compressor Facility, miles	Distance to Separation Facility, miles
Lodi	401	6	9
Stockton	2,603	18	21
Galt	144	5	8
Sacramento	15,980	> 18	> 21

Source: Dames & Moore, 1998.

Operation of the project would require an estimated 15 employees to maintain the facilities and the pipeline. This analysis is based on the assumption that operations-related personnel would be hired locally.

Impact 3.2-1: Temporary Increase in Local Population, Resulting in Minimal Growth in Regional Population

Implementation of the proposed project is estimated to attract 60 construction workers to San Joaquin and Sacramento Counties during the 4- to 5-month construction period estimated by LGS. Construction of the project facilities would not be likely to result in a large permanent population increase in San Joaquin or Sacramento County. As discussed previously, workers from the local area would accomplish most of the construction work. Additionally, because the construction period is estimated to last for only 4–5 months, some workers could choose to commute to the project site rather than temporarily relocate to the area (see Section 3.11, “Public Services and Socioeconomics”).

Operation of the project facilities would not result in a substantial increase in the population of San Joaquin or Sacramento County. Because the project is near the large Sacramento metropolitan statistical area, this analysis assumes that all operations-related personnel would be hired locally. Therefore, this impact of the proposed project is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Impact 3.2-2: Temporary Increase in Local Population and Temporary Need for Housing for up to 60 People

Implementation of the proposed project would create a need for temporary housing for up to 60 people during the 4- to 5-month construction period estimated by LGS. Based on the total number of available hotel and motel rooms in San Joaquin and Sacramento Counties, the temporary increase in demand for housing associated with the project is expected to be accommodated without difficulty regardless of the time of year during which construction takes place. Therefore, this impact of the proposed project is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

Impact 3.2-3: No Displacement of Existing Housing Units or Displacement of a Substantial Number of People That Would Necessitate the Construction of Replacement Housing Elsewhere

Implementation of the proposed project is not associated with the displacement or relocation of any existing housing units or current residents. Therefore, this impact of the proposed project is less than significant.

3.2 Population and Housing

Mitigation Measures

None required.

3.2.5 IMPACTS OF THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY ROUTE ALTERNATIVE AND MITIGATION MEASURES

IMPACTS

The effects of the Public Right-of-Way Route Alternative on population and housing would be identical to those described for the proposed project. These impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

3.2.6 IMPACTS OF THE EXISTING PIPELINE CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVE AND MITIGATION MEASURES

IMPACTS

The effects of the Existing Pipeline Corridor Alternative on population and housing would be identical to those described for the proposed project. These impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

3.2.7 IMPACTS OF THE COMPOSITE ROUTE ALTERNATIVE AND MITIGATION MEASURES

IMPACTS

The effects of the Composite Route Alternative on population and housing would be identical to those described for the proposed project. These impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

3.2 Population and Housing

REFERENCES—POPULATION AND HOUSING

California Department of Finance, *Report E-5: Population and Housing Statistics for California Cities and Counties (1990-1998)*, Sacramento, Calif., 1998.

California Department of Finance, "Sacramento and San Joaquin County Profiles," <http://www.dof.ca.gov> (updated February 1999), obtained March 19, 1999.

Dames & Moore, *Lodi Gas Storage Project Proponent's Environmental Assessment* (Job No. 39615-001-177), Fresno, Calif., October 29, 1998.