

4.14 Population and Housing

This section identifies and evaluates issues related to Population and Housing in the context of the Project and alternatives. This section discusses population trends in the vicinity of the site, including incorporated and unincorporated areas of the County, including the City of Cupertino. This section relies primarily on information from the U.S. Census (Census), the Association of Bay Area Governments¹ (ABAG), and the Housing Elements of the County's and City of Cupertino's General Plans, including the County's Housing Element 2009. No future land uses involving residential or commercial development are considered under the Project.

4.14.1 Setting

4.14.1.1 Regional and Local Setting

Section 2.2, *Project Location*, provides general information about the Project's regional and local setting. This Section 4.14.1 provides setting information specific to population and housing.

County of Santa Clara

Population

According to ABAG data, the County is the most populous among the nine-county Bay Area region,² followed by Alameda and Contra Costa counties. The County's population was estimated to be approximately 1,822,000 in 2010.³ The population of the unincorporated areas of the County was approximately 103,100. ABAG anticipates that by 2030, the County will have a population of approximately 2,310,800, with a population in the unincorporated areas of approximately 120,100 (ABAG, 2009). **Table 4.14-1** summarizes population trends in the Bay Area counties. The County's population growth was moderate between 2000 and 2010 (an increase of approximately 139,415 people, or 8 percent), while in the unincorporated areas of the County, the rate of population growth was much less (an increase of approximately 2,800 or 3 percent). Between 2015 and 2030, the County's overall population is expected to increase by about 19 percent, and the County is expected to maintain its ranking as the most populous Bay Area county. The unincorporated areas are expected to grow by 12 percent, or 12,900 people, during the same timeframe.

Table 4.14-2 summarizes population trends within the County. The unincorporated area of the County ranks as the fourth most populated area in the County, following San Jose, Sunnyvale, and Santa Clara.

¹ ABAG is a regional planning agency, representing the cities and counties of the Bay Area.

² The nine counties are: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma.

³ According to the 2010 U.S. Census data, the County's population was 1,781,642.

**TABLE 4.14-1
 BAY AREA POPULATION PROJECTIONS BY COUNTY, 2000-2030**

County	2000	2005	2010	% change 2000-2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	% change 2015-2030
Alameda	1,443,741	1,505,300	1,549,800	7%	1,626,100	1,705,900	1,787,300	1,874,600	15%
Contra Costa	948,816	1,023,400	1,090,300	15%	1,130,700	1,177,400	1,225,500	1,273,700	13%
Marin	247,289	252,600	256,500	4%	260,300	264,000	267,300	270,900	4%
Napa	124,279	133,700	138,800	12%	142,300	144,600	146,300	147,500	4%
San Francisco	776,733	795,800	810,000	4%	837,500	867,100	900,500	934,800	12%
San Mateo	707,163	721,900	733,300	4%	766,900	801,300	832,400	862,800	13%
Santa Clara	1,682,585	1,763,000	1,822,000	8%	1,945,300	2,063,100	2,185,800	2,310,800	19%
Solano	394,542	421,600	443,100	12%	458,500	472,100	484,600	495,800	8%
Sonoma	458,614	479,200	497,900	9%	509,900	522,500	535,200	548,400	8%
Bay Area	6,783,762	7,096,500	7,341,700	8%	7,677,500	8,018,000	8,364,900	8,719,300	14%

SOURCE: ABAG (2009)

**TABLE 4.14-2
 SANTA CLARA COUNTY POPULATION BY MUNICIPALITY, 2000-2030**

Municipality	2000	2005	2010	% change 2000-2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	% change 2015-2030
Campbell	38,138	38,300	40,500	6%	41,800	44,100	45,200	45,900	10%
Cupertino	50,546	53,500	55,200	9%	55,800	56,300	56,700	57,100	2%
Gilroy	41,464	48,200	49,800	20%	55,000	58,700	62,100	66,000	20%
Los Altos	27,693	27,900	28,400	3%	28,700	29,400	29,600	30,200	5%
Los Altos Hills	7,902	8,500	8,800	11%	8,800	8,800	8,900	9,000	2%
Los Gatos	28,592	28,900	29,600	4%	29,900	30,000	30,000	30,100	1%
Milpitas	62,698	64,800	69,000	10%	74,700	82,300	90,400	98,100	31%
Monte Sereno	3,483	3,500	3,400	-2%	3,500	3,600	3,600	3,600	3%
Morgan Hill	33,556	36,500	38,200	14%	40,200	42,200	44,100	45,800	14%
Mountain View	70,708	71,800	72,100	2%	76,100	80,200	84,100	87,300	15%
Palo Alto	58,598	61,400	61,600	5%	66,200	70,400	73,400	80,400	21%
San Jose	894,943	943,300	981,000	10%	1,063,600	1,137,700	1,219,500	1,299,700	22%
Santa Clara	102,361	109,400	114,700	12%	120,700	128,800	138,600	148,200	23%
Saratoga	29,843	30,600	31,400	5%	31,400	31,400	31,400	31,400	0%
Sunnyvale	131,760	133,000	135,200	3%	141,700	147,300	152,000	157,900	11%
Unincorporated County of Santa Clara	100,300	103,400	103,100	3%	107,200	111,900	116,200	120,100	12%
	1,682,585	1,763,000	1,822,000	8%	1,945,300	2,063,100	2,185,800	2,310,800	19%

SOURCE: ABAG (2009)

Employment

The total number of jobs in the County, held by both County residents and non-residents, was estimated to be 906,270 as of 2010, with the total number of jobs in unincorporated areas of the County at 50,400. By 2030, the County is projected to include approximately 1,292,490 jobs, 62,620 of which would be held in unincorporated County areas. This represents an increase of 32 percent Countywide and an increase of 17 percent in the unincorporated areas. There were an estimated 31,780 jobs in the City of Cupertino as of 2010. This number is forecasted to increase by 10 percent between 2015 and 2030, to a total of 35,880 jobs (ABAG, 2009). **Table 4.14-3** summarizes employment trends within the County, unincorporated areas, and the City of Cupertino.

**TABLE 4.14-3
SANTA CLARA COUNTY (COUNTYWIDE AND UNINCORPORATED) AND CITY OF CUPERTINO
EMPLOYMENT TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS, 2005-2030**

Municipality	Jobs							
	2005	2010	% Change 2005-2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	% Change 2015-2030
Cupertino	31,060	31,780	-17%	32,550	33,340	34,260	35,880	10%
Unincorporated	48,660	50,400	-3%	53,590	56,670	59,690	62,620	17%
County of Santa Clara	872,860	906,270	-13%	981,230	1,071,980	1,177,520	1,292,490	32%

SOURCE: ABAG (2009)

Housing

Between 2000 and 2010, the number of housing units increased throughout the Bay Area by approximately 8 percent. During this period, the County experienced an approximate 9 percent growth in the housing stock, adding about 50,179 units. In terms of the percentage increase, Santa Clara was among the counties that experienced a relatively moderate growth in the housing stock (counties with slower growth included San Mateo, Marin, and San Francisco). **Table 4.14-4** compares the number of housing units from 2000 to 2010 in each of the nine Bay Area Counties.

City of Cupertino

As noted in Section 4.11, *Land Use and Planning*, the site is partially within the City of Cupertino's urban services boundary. Based on Census 2005-2009 American Community Survey data, which includes the Census data closest to the June 2007 baseline date, the City of Cupertino contains 52,785 people, 18,915 housing units, and has an average household size of 2.92 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011).

**TABLE 4.14-4
 NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS BY COUNTY FOR THE BAY AREA 2000-2010**

County	2000 Housing Units	2005 Housing Units	2010 Housing Units	% Change in Housing Units 2000-2010
Alameda	540,183	558,840	575,465	7%
Contra Costa	354,577	378,343	400,268	13%
Marin	104,990	107,482	108,850	4%
Napa	48,554	52,209	54,348	12%
San Francisco	346,527	355,903	368,136	6%
San Mateo	260,576	266,842	269,491	3%
Santa Clara	579,329	607,035	629,508	9%
Solano	134,513	146,251	153,280	14%
Sonoma	183,153	191,949	200,332	9%
Bay Area	2,552,402	2,664,854	2,759,678	8%

SOURCE: State of California (2010)

4.14.1.2 Regulatory Setting

County of Santa Clara

General Plan Housing Element

The County adopted its Housing Element (known as the 2009 Update) in August 2010. The County's Housing Element establishes comprehensive, long-term objectives and implementing policies for the housing within the County. Those guiding and implementing policies that are pertinent to the Project are discussed below. See Section 4.11, *Land Use and Planning*, for other policies in the Countywide Plan and the draft Countywide Plan Update applicable to the Project.

Policy C-HG 2: Housing at urban densities shall be built within the cities, not in unincorporated areas.

Policy C-HG(i) 2: Maintain and, where necessary, strengthen County and city's land use policies and agreements which focus urban development to areas within city urban service areas.

Implementation of the Project would be consistent with these policies.

4.14.2 Baseline

Baseline conditions reflect the 2007 operation of the Project Area as a limestone and aggregate mining quarry, including necessary staffing levels and operations and maintenance activities relating to mining operations and the surrounding open space areas. As described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, the Quarry has employed an average of 35 persons over the last 10 years, including equipment operators, maintenance personnel, plant operators, site managers, plant engineers, administrators, weigh masters, and quality control technicians. As shown in Table 2-9, in 2007 the Quarry had 32 work days with one shift, 218 work days with two shifts, and 25 work

days with three shifts, for a total of 275 work days. There were no residences located within the Project Area in 2007, nor are there any located there currently. The conditions described in the setting consist of time periods that include the year 2007. As such, the data adequately represent population and housing characteristics of the baseline year.

4.14.3 Significance Criteria

Consistent with County's Environmental Checklist and Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the Project would have a significant impact related to population and housing if it would:

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

4.14.4 Discussion of Criteria with No Population and Housing Impacts

As explained below, the Project would have no impact related to either of the two established significance criteria.

a) The Project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, directly or indirectly.

The Quarry has employed an average of 35 persons over approximately the last 10 years, with actual employment at any given time depending upon market conditions, the level of production, and other considerations. Employees perform various operational, environmental, and administrative tasks. Employees include equipment operators, maintenance personnel, plant operator, site managers, plant engineers, administrators, and quality control technicians. As the proposed reclamation proceeds, an average of up to 14 additional employees (49 employees) would be required during Phase 1 activities, and up to three additional employees would be required during Phase 2. Given the small number of additional staff, it is anticipated that the temporary positions would be filled from the local labor pool available in the County, with workers expected to commute to the site rather than move. As such, the additional employees would not directly induce population growth in the vicinity of the Project. No additional employees would be required during Phase 3 activities.

The Project also would not indirectly induce substantial population growth by creating new opportunities for local industry or commerce. Implementation of the Project would result in the reclamation of lands to make them suitable for future open space use. The increased suitability of lands for such use would not induce substantial numbers of people to move into the area. Accordingly, the Project would not induce a short- or long-term demand, either directly or indirectly, on population growth. The Project would cause no impact related to criterion a).

b) The Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

There is no existing housing, or people living, in the Project Area. Therefore, no existing housing or people would be displaced by the Project. For this reason, it would not be necessary, as result of the Project, to construct replacement housing elsewhere. Consequently, the Project would cause no impact related to criterion b).

4.14.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Because implementation of the Project would cause no impact related to population and housing, there are no impacts and no mitigation measures to be discussed in this section.

4.14.6 Alternatives

4.14.6.1 Alternative 1: Complete Backfill Alternative

Reclamation activities associated with Alternative 1 would be the similar to the Project, and this alternative would use the same labor pool as the Project. Like the Project, Alternative 1 would not induce substantial population growth directly or indirectly, as temporary increases in staffing would be filled by the local labor pool, and this alternative would not create new opportunities for local industry or commerce. Furthermore, Alternative 1 would not displace any existing housing or people. Therefore, impacts related to population and housing would be the same as under the Project (No Impact).

4.14.6.2 Alternative 2: Central Materials Storage Area Alternative

Reclamation activities associated with Alternative 2 would be the similar to the Project, and this alternative would use the same labor pool as the Project. Like the Project, Alternative 2 would not induce substantial population growth directly or indirectly, as temporary increases in staffing would be filled by the local labor pool, and this alternative would not create new opportunities for local industry or commerce. Furthermore, Alternative 2 would not displace any existing housing or people. Therefore, impacts related to population and housing would be the same as under the Project (No Impact).

4.14.6.3 No Project Alternative

Reclamation activities associated with the No Project Alternative would be comparable to those of the Project, but would occur approximately 7 years later than the Project. This alternative would use the same labor pool as the Project. Like the Project, the No Project Alternative would not induce substantial population growth directly or indirectly, as temporary increases in staffing would be filled by the local labor pool, and this alternative would not create new opportunities for local industry or commerce. Furthermore, the No Project Alternative would not displace any existing housing or people. Therefore, impacts related to population and housing would be the same as under the Project (No Impact).

References – Population and Housing

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). 2008. *San Francisco Bay Area Housing Needs Plan, 2007-2014*, June.

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). 2009. *Projections 2009*.

State of California, Department of Finance. 2010. *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2010, with 2000 Benchmark*. Sacramento, California, May.

U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census. *American Fact Finder, DP-1 Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010. 2010 Demographic Profile Data, Geography: Santa Clara County, California*. http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_10_DP_DPDP1&prodType=table (accessed September 27, 2011).

U.S. Census Bureau, 2011 Census. *American Fact Finder, Fact Sheet, City of Cupertino, California, 2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-year estimates*. http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ACSSAFFacts?_event=Search&geo_id=&_geoContext=&_street=&_county=cupertino&_cityTown=cupertino&_state=04000US06&_zip=&_lang=en&_sse=on&pctxt=fph&pgsl=010 (accessed November 15, 2011).