

---

## 6. POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

---

This chapter describes existing local and county population, housing, employment, and jobs/housing ratio characteristics; evaluates project impacts in relation to these factors; and identifies any mitigation measures warranted to reduce or eliminate related significant environmental impacts.

### 6.1 SETTING

#### **6.1.1 Local and Regional Population and Housing Trends**

(a) Population. Table 6.1 indicates current population totals and trends compiled by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) for the City of Redwood City and San Mateo County; historical and current data are from the U.S. Census, and projections are derived by ABAG. ABAG estimates that the year 2000 population of Redwood City was 75,402 people. This total represents approximately 10.7 percent of the ABAG-estimated year-2000 San Mateo County population total (707,161 people).

The data in Table 6.1 also indicate that the population of Redwood City grew by approximately 14 percent (an increase of 9,330 people) over the ten-year period between 1990 and 2000. During the same period, the population of San Mateo County grew by approximately 9 percent (57,538 people).

For the ten-year period from 2000 to 2010, the ABAG-projected population increase for Redwood City will be approximately 7 percent (an increase of 5,198 people), reflecting a post-2000 decrease in the anticipated rate of growth. This projected 2000-to-2010 Redwood City population growth rate is still greater than that anticipated for the county as a whole (approximately 6.7 percent, or an increase of 47,439 people). Redwood City and San Mateo County ten-year population growth rates between 2010 to 2020 are projected to be substantially higher at 36.6 and 30.3 percent, respectively.

(b) Population Per Household. There were an estimated 2.69 persons per household in Redwood City in 2000. Based on ABAG projections, average household size in Redwood City will increase to approximately 2.75 by the year 2010, and approximately 2.88 by the year 2020. By comparison, San Mateo County has a larger average household size, estimated at 2.78

**Table 6.1**  
**ABAG-PROJECTED POPULATION AND HOUSING TRENDS IN REDWOOD CITY AND**  
**SAN MATEO COUNTY, 1990 TO 2020**

**Comment: WATCHOUT!!!**  
 half-pager

	<u>1990</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>Change</u> <u>(10 years)</u> <u>1990-2000</u>	<u>Projected</u> <u>Year 2010</u>	<u>Projected</u> <u>Change</u> <u>(10 years)</u> <u>2000-2010</u>	<u>Projected</u> <u>Year 2020</u>	<u>Projected</u> <u>Change</u> <u>(10 years)</u> <u>2010-2020</u>
<i>Redwood City</i>							
Population	66,072	75,402	9,330 (+14%)	80,600	5,198 (+7%)	110,100	29,500 (+36.6)
Households	25,493	28,060	2,567 (+10%)	29,300	1,240 (+4.4%)	38,170	8,870 (+30.3%)
<i>San Mateo County</i>							
Population	649,623	707,161	57,538 (+9%)	754,600	47,439 (+6.7%)	795,100	40,500 (+5.4%)
Households	241,914	254,103	12,189 (+5%)	267,110	13,007 (+5%)	281,670	14,560 (+5.5%)

SOURCE: Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 2002, December 2001; Wagstaff and Associates, 2002.

persons per household for 2000, which is projected to increase to approximately 2.83 persons per household by 2010, and 2.82 by 2020.<sup>1</sup>

(c) Housing. As listed in Table 6.1, the number of households in Redwood City (which roughly equates to the number of housing units) totaled approximately 28,060 in 2000, representing approximately 11 percent of the countywide total (254,103 households). The Redwood City household total increased by approximately 10 percent (2,567 households) between 1990 and 2000. The number of households in the county as a whole increased by half as much, 5 percent (12,189 households) over the same period, indicating that the county experienced a slower rate of housing growth than Redwood City over the last decade. Redwood City has a higher percentage of multifamily units (housing structures with five or more units per structure)

<sup>1</sup>Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Projections 2002, December 2001.

(33 percent) than the rest of San Mateo County (27 percent).<sup>2</sup>

The ABAG projections in Table 6.1 indicate that, as with population growth, the ten-year rate of housing growth experienced in Redwood City is expected to decrease to 4.4 percent for the 2000 to 2010 decade, and substantially increase to 30.3 percent between 2010 and 2020. In San Mateo County as a whole, the ten-year housing growth rate is projected to remain steady at 5 percent over the 2000 to 2010 period, and is expected to increase slightly decrease to 5.5 percent by 2020.

(d) Existing On-Site Population and Housing. There are no permanent housing structures currently on the project site. The Pete's Harbor property currently contains approximately 12 occupied recreational vehicles and one occupied mobile home. Also, 90 boats/tenants in Pete's Harbor currently pay rent as live-aboard residences. There may be additional "unofficial" live-aboard residences. In addition, prior to the vacating of Peninsula Marina, there were 155 official and approximately 50 unofficial live-aboard residences in that marina, for a former on-site population on both the Peninsula Marina and Pete's Harbor properties of approximately 308 persons (assuming one person per boat [295] and recreational vehicle/mobile home [13]). Assuming several "unofficial" live-aboards in Pete's Harbor, the current on-site residential population is estimated at approximately 110 persons.

### **6.1.2 Projected Housing Needs**

---

<sup>2</sup>City of Redwood City. *Draft Housing Element, 1999-2006*, November 2001, chapter 3, p. 1-2.

(a) ABAG Housing Needs Determinations. Under section 65581.4 of the California Government Code, cities and counties are required to make a sustained, serious effort to provide for their appropriate share of regional housing needs, as determined by local councils of governments. To help achieve this mandate, ABAG, which is the council of governments for the nine-county San Francisco Bay region, periodically makes housing needs determinations for each city and county in the region. The determinations are based on anticipated employment opportunities, commuting patterns, and site availability for residential development in the planning area. The ABAG Executive Board released the 1999-2006 determinations on March 15, 2001.<sup>3</sup>

(b) Housing Needs by Income Level. State law requires ABAG to allocate housing needs for each city and county in the region according to four specified income levels, so that each jurisdiction can make plans to provide for its "fair share" of regional housing needs by income group. To describe these housing needs, ABAG uses the income categories of **very low** for household incomes of up to 50 percent of the median income for the region (i.e., the county), **low** for 51 to 80 percent of the regional median income, **moderate** for 81 to 120 percent of the regional median income, and **above moderate** for household incomes greater than 120 percent of the regional median income.

(c) Preliminary Housing Needs Determinations for Redwood City. Table 6.2 indicates ABAG-projected housing needs for Redwood City for the period 1999 to 2006. As listed in the table, ABAG has determined that a total of 2,544 housing units would be needed in Redwood City during this seven-year period, including 534 units affordable to **very low-income** households, 256 units affordable to **low-income** households, 660 units affordable to **moderate-income** households, and 1,094 units affordable to **above moderate-income** households. These "fair-share" totals represent the ABAG-projected number of units that would need to be added to Redwood City's housing stock over the period 1999 to 2006 in order to achieve an equitable distribution of housing opportunities.

---

<sup>3</sup>Available on the Internet at [www.abag.ca.gov](http://www.abag.ca.gov).

The Redwood City *Draft Housing Element* states that Redwood City has adequate sites to meet the housing need identified by ABAG through 2006.<sup>4</sup> The Element identifies the Pete's Harbor property as an "infill site" available for high-density housing if the site is determined "*suitable (i.e., adequate water, sewer, roadway infrastructure capacity) for future residential development.*"<sup>5</sup> Between January 1, 1999 and July 31, 2001, 54 very low-income and 19 moderate-income units were added to the affordable housing stock in Redwood City through new construction. The remaining need for affordable housing includes 480 very low-income units, 256 low-income units, and 641 moderate-income units. The City's *Draft Housing Element* indicates that the affordable housing requirement applicable under State redevelopment law to the City's designated redevelopment area (15 percent of all new units within redevelopment boundaries shall be affordable) will help assure that enough affordable units will be built to meet the ABAG-projected need, assuming adequate private sector capability to build. The City's major planning initiative from 2001 to 2006, the Downtown Area Plan (see Table 4.1 in chapter 4, Land Use, herein), is located completely within the boundary of a redevelopment area.<sup>6</sup> The Marina Shores Village project site is not within the redevelopment area boundary.

### **6.1.3 Local and Regional Employment**

(a) Existing and Projected Redwood City Employment. Table 6.3 lists ABAG's employment estimates and projections for Redwood City and San Mateo County for the period 1990 to 2010. ABAG estimates that employment in Redwood City increased substantially, by 19,980 jobs (48 percent) between 1990 and 2000, more than twice the rate of the countywide jobs increase. ABAG projects an increase of another 5,910 new jobs in Redwood City by 2010, representing an approximately 10 percent increase in employment between 2000 and 2010, similar to what is expected countywide. The ABAG-projected employment total in Redwood City by 2010 (67,610 jobs) represents approximately 16 percent of the 433,820 total jobs projected countywide by 2010. Between 2010 and 2020, the rate of job growth in the City is expected to be the same as that of the county (10.9 percent).

---

<sup>4</sup>City of Redwood City, 2001, chapter 7, p. 1.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., chapter 4, p. 4.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., chapter 7, p. 2.

Table 6.2  
 PRELIMINARY ABAG-PROJECTED HOUSING NEEDS IN REDWOOD CITY BY INCOME  
 CATEGORY, 1999 TO 2006

	<u>Very Low</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Above Moderate</u>	<u>Total Projected Need</u>
1999-2006	534	256	660	1,094	2,544

SOURCE: City of Redwood City, *Draft Housing Element, 1999-2006*, November 2001.

Table 6.3  
 ABAG-PROJECTED EMPLOYMENT TRENDS IN REDWOOD CITY AND SAN MATEO  
 COUNTY, 1990 TO 2020

	<u>1990</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>Change (10 years) 1990-2000</u>	<u>Projected Year 2010</u>	<u>Projected Change (10 years) 2000-2010</u>	<u>Projected Year 2020</u>	<u>Projected Change (10 years) 2010-2020</u>
<i>Redwood City</i>							
Total Jobs	41,720	61,700	19,980 (+48%)	67,610	5,910 (+10%)	74,990	7,380 (+10.9%)
<i>San Mateo County</i>							
Total Jobs	326,670	395,890	69,220 (+21%)	433,820	37,930 (+10%)	480,970	47,150 (+10.9%)

SOURCE: Association of Bay Area Governments, *Projections 2002*, December 2001; Wagstaff and Associates, 2002.

(b) Existing and Projected Countywide Employment. As indicated in Table 6.3, employment in the county increased by 69,220 jobs (21 percent) between 1990 and 2000. The table also indicates that employment in the county is expected to increase by another 37,930 jobs (or by approximately 10 percent) over the ten-year period from 2000 to 2010, and by 471,150 jobs (or by approximately 10.9 percent) over the ten-year period from 2010 to 2020.

(c) Existing On-Site Employment. Existing employment on the Pete's Harbor portion of the project site is minimal, limited primarily to the restaurant employees, harbor master, and proprietor of John's RV repair.

The Peninsula Marina portion of the project site currently includes approximately 88,400 square feet of office space and a 1,600-square-foot restaurant. Assuming full occupancy of these on-site uses, based on established standards for employment generation (one employee per 450 square feet of restaurant, one employee per 350 square feet of office space),<sup>7</sup> total current employment on the Peninsula Marina property is estimated at approximately 257 persons.

#### **6.1.4 Local Jobs/Housing Balance**

Regional planning goals have increasingly emphasized the need to improve the balance between housing and jobs in various subregions as a means of achieving "sustainable" or "smart" growth and reducing intraregional commuting and associated traffic congestion and air quality impacts. The term "jobs/housing ratio" is commonly used to describe the relationship between the number of local jobs available and the number of local employed residents. While the "jobs/housing ratio" is the term most often used, the "jobs/employed resident ratio" is the more precise measure of the local relationship of housing to jobs, since households, on average, contain more than one employed resident. To the degree that a balance is achieved between local jobs and employed residents, there is greater opportunity for local residents to work close to where they live. A "balanced" local "jobs/housing ratio" (i.e., a ratio of approximately 1.0) therefore tends to reduce a community's contribution to regional traffic congestion, noise, and air quality impacts.

Where a city's or subregion's jobs-to-employed residents ratio is substantially higher than the regional ratio, a higher tendency toward in-commuting is indicated (i.e., more people commuting into the area for work); where the local ratio is substantially lower than the regional ratio, a higher tendency towards out-commuting is indicated (i.e., more people commuting out of the area for work). Generally, the goal is to seek a balanced ratio between employed residents and jobs to minimize in- and out-commuting during the peak traffic hours.

It is important to note, however, that a simple numerical balance in the jobs/housing ratio does not necessarily indicate that local residents have adequate opportunity to work in their community. Other factors, such as the match between local resident employee skills and the

---

<sup>7</sup>Caltrans District 4. Progress Reports on Trip Ends Generation Research Counts (series).

skills required for local jobs, and particularly the match between local job compensation levels and local housing prices, also influence local resident opportunities to work in the community.

(a) Existing and Projected San Mateo County Jobs/Housing Balance. Table 6.4 illustrates the jobs/housing ratio trend for Redwood City and San Mateo County as a whole. The table indicates that, in 2000, the county had slightly more employed residents than jobs, resulting in a jobs/employed resident ratio of 0.98 (or 0.98 jobs per employed resident). The ratio is expected to increase to 1.01 by 2010 and to 1.05 by 2020. The figures suggest that the county currently has a relatively good balance of jobs to employed residents. However, as noted in Table 6.4, the trend of increasing jobs was expected in ABAG Projections 2002 (December 2001) to continue; by 2020, the jobs/housing balance was expected to be 1.05 countywide, as jobs in the county were expected to outpace employed residents (i.e., housing units), indicating an expected increase in in-commuting to the county, and a continued need for housing countywide. (No ABAG or other official employment data was available at this writing indicating how the recent, post-December 2001, high-tech activity downtrend has affected these projections.)

(b) Existing and Projected Redwood City Jobs/Housing Balance. As indicated in Table 6.4, Redwood City had an estimated 62,000 jobs and 57,607 employed residents in 2000, or 1.08 jobs per employed resident. The figures in Table 6.4 indicate that a trend towards in-commuting will continue in Redwood City. In its December 2001 projections (ABAG Projections 2002), ABAG projected that there will be 74,990 jobs and 64,600 employed residents in Redwood City by the year 2020, or 1.16 jobs per employed resident. This projected local jobs/housing ratio indicated an expected increasing shortage of housing compared to jobs within Redwood City over the next 20 years, although the recent high-tech activity downtrend has probably reduced the degree of shortage, at least in the short term.

## 6.2 PERTINENT PLANS AND POLICIES

### 6.2.1 Redwood City Strategic General Plan

(a) Currently-Adopted General Plan. Adopted Redwood City Strategic General Plan goals and policies relevant to population, housing, employment and jobs/housing balance include the following:

- *Residential development should be located only where services and facilities can be provided.* (Land Use Policy L-1, page 6-5)
- *Higher residential densities should be promoted at locations near or within commercial and financial centers, and transportation terminals.* (Land Use Policy L-3, page 6-5)



**Comment: WATCHOUT!!!**  
 half-pager

Table 6.4  
 ABAG-PROJECTED JOBS/EMPLOYED RESIDENTS RATIO TRENDS IN REDWOOD CITY  
 AND SAN MATEO COUNTY, 1990 TO 2020

Year	Jobs		Employed Residents		Number of Jobs per Employed Resident	
	Redwood City <sup>a</sup>	County	Redwood City <sup>a</sup>	County	Redwood City	County
1990	42,020	326,670	48,616	353,676	0.86	0.92
2000	62,000	395,890	57,607	403,083	1.08	0.98
2010	68,210	433,820	61,200	430,900	1.11	1.01
2020	74,990	480,970	64,600	458,000	1.16	1.05

SOURCE: Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 2002, December 2001; Wagstaff and Associates, 2002.

<sup>a</sup> Jobs and employed residents data are for the Redwood City Sphere of Influence (i.e., including some adjacent county area). An October 2002 study prepared for the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Redwood City by Keyser Marston Associates, *Jobs Housing Relationships: The Growth Imbalance and What Local Governments Can Do*, includes jobs/employed residents data for 1990 and 2000, derived from U.S. Census data for the city limits of Redwood City. In order to maintain consistency with ABAG employed residents projections for 2010 and 2020, Table 6.4 utilizes the Redwood City Sphere of Influence for calculations.

- *Commercial land should be distributed in a manner that maximizes community accessibility to a variety of retail commercial outlets and services and minimizes the need for automobile travel.* (Land Use Policy L-4, page 6-5)
- *Promote the construction of lower-income housing developments located in areas that are convenient to public transportation, shopping, recreation, schools, hospitals, employment, and other community facilities.* (Housing Policy 1, page 8-28)
- *Encourage public/private partnerships in the development of housing wherever possible.* (Housing Policy 6, page 8-28)

(b) Draft Housing Element Update. The following policies are contained in the City's new *Draft Housing Element (1999-2006)* currently under review by the state. Since the *Draft Housing Element* has not yet been approved by the state, the policies below cannot be considered adopted City policy, but are instead listed to provide a framework for determining the City's future housing policy direction.

- *The City shall provide opportunities for Redwood City's share of regional housing needs for all income groups and encourage a variety of housing types.* (Draft Housing Policy A, chapter 8, page 2)
- *The City will provide housing opportunity for Redwood City's share of the regional housing need for all income groups, with priority given to very low- and low-income households.* (Draft Housing Policy B, chapter 8, page 5)
- *Incentive Program to Allocate Units to Service Occupations. Develop a program to offer incentives for developers of market rate housing when they agree to set aside affordable units within private developments. This program can be used to increase the number of low- and very low-income units in Redwood City and to target units to service occupations (i.e., public safety workers, school teachers, hospital workers, workers in service industries, etc.).* (Draft Housing Program C.7, chapter 8, page 11)
- *The City shall assess the potential demand for child care generated by proposed, large residential developments and facilitate the development and acquisition of space for child care centers and family child care homes.* (Draft Housing Program C.9, chapter 8, page 12)

### 6.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### 6.3.1 Significance Criteria

Based on the CEQA Guidelines, the project would be considered in this EIR to have a significant impact on population, employment, or housing conditions if it would:<sup>8</sup>

- (1) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of the City of Redwood City (including but not limited to the General Plan or Zoning Ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect;
- (2) Induce substantial population 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

---

<sup>8</sup>CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G, items IX(b) and XII (a) through (c).

- (3) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

### **6.3.2 Project Population Characteristics**

As indicated in Table 6.5, at buildout and **full occupancy** of the 1,930-unit residential portion of the proposed project, which is anticipated to take approximately 10 to 15 years, there would be an estimated 4,020 people living in the new housing units.<sup>9</sup> Full occupancy could occur at a faster or slower rate, depending upon market conditions. Subtracting the displacement of approximately 110 persons currently living on-site, the **net** direct population gain due to the project would be approximately 3,910 persons.

### **6.3.3 Project Housing Characteristics**

As indicated in chapter 3 (Project Description) and listed in Table 6.5, the project proposes an ultimate total of approximately 1,930 housing units. All approximately 110 existing "mobile" housing units (i.e., existing live-aboard boats, recreational vehicles, and the mobile home) on the site would be displaced.

**Comment:** new tab grid for indented text underneath boxes--(just the old one with 1.167 added)

The site is divided into two discontinuous portions, the Pete's Harbor and Peninsula Marina properties. The project as currently proposed would result in an average residential density on the Peninsula Marina portion of the site of approximately 67 units per acre, and an average residential density on the Pete's Harbor portion of the site of approximately 55 units per acre, for an overall average residential density of approximately 63 units per acre. As currently proposed by the applicant, the residential components of the site would consist of the following:

- Approximately **1,016 high-rise units** to be developed in up to eight 23-story towers at Peninsula Marina (648 units) and up to five 21-story towers at Pete's Harbor (approximately 368 units). These units would average 1,670 square feet in size.
- Approximately **99 townhouses** to be developed at Peninsula Marina (approximately 50 units) and Pete's Harbor (approximately 49 units). These units would average 1,550 square feet in size and would be contained in two-story buildings.
- Approximately **815 low-rise flats**, including approximately 599 units to be developed at Peninsula Marina and approximately 216 units to be developed at Pete's Harbor. These units would be in four- to six-story buildings and would average 1,280 square feet in size.

---

<sup>9</sup>This estimate assumes full occupancy rates. If a vacancy rate of five percent were applied, the buildout population would total approximately 3,820 residents.

Table 6.5  
 ESTIMATED MARINA SHORES VILLAGE PROJECT HOUSING, POPULATION, AND  
 EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS--2020

**Residential Uses:**

	<u>Estimated Avg. Population/Unit<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>Estimated Number of Units<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>Estimated Household Population</u>	<u>Estimated Employed Residents<sup>3</sup></u>
Two-bedroom/two-bath	2.10	1,498	3,146	--
Two-bedroom/2.5-bath	2.25	99	223	--
One-bedroom/one-bath	1.60	242	387	--
Three-bedroom/two-bath	2.90	91	264	--
<b>Total</b>		1,930	4,020	3,262

**Non-Residential Uses:**

	<u>Square Feet</u>	<u>Jobs<sup>4</sup></u>
Office	300,000	857
Retail	<u>12,000</u>	<u>27</u>
<b>Total</b>	312,000	884

SOURCE: Glenborough-Pauls, LLC, 2001-2002; Wagstaff and Associates, 2002.

<sup>1</sup> Household population assumptions based on the experience of the EIR author with multifamily for-sale residential projects.

<sup>2</sup> Based on preliminary project designs provided by the project applicant.

<sup>3</sup> Based on an overall employed residents per household ratio of 1.69 for Redwood City, derived from ABAG (Projections 2002) data for the year 2020 (64,600 employed residents divided by 38,170 households = 1.69 employed residents per household).

<sup>4</sup> Job calculations based on 450 square feet per employee for retail use (12,000 square feet divided by 450 square feet per employee = 27 employees) and 350 square feet per employee for office use (300,000 square feet divided by 350 square feet per employee = 857 employees), derived from Caltrans District 4 Progress Reports on Trip Ends Generation Research Counts (series).

### **6.3.4 Project Population Characteristics**

Table 6.5 includes a project population estimate derived by the EIR authors based on preliminary project unit characteristics provided by the project applicant. As shown, the estimated total household population of a 1,930-unit project with the illustrated mix of unit types at buildout would be approximately 4,020 people. Taking into consideration the approximately 110 persons assumed to be currently living on the project site who would be displaced by the project, the *net* on-site population increase would be approximately 3,910 people.

### **6.3.5 Project Employment Characteristics**

(a) Project Employment Characteristics. Table 6.5 above indicates that the project would provide approximately 300,000 square feet of office space and approximately 12,000 square feet of retail space, which would accommodate an estimated 884 employees, based on assumptions of 350 square feet per employee for office use and 450 square feet per employee for retail use.<sup>10</sup> The applicant anticipates that the office and retail components of the project would be developed after construction of a substantial portion of the Peninsula Marina residential development, and before completion of construction of the Pete's Harbor residential development.

(b) Project Relationship to Local and Regional Employment. The anticipated 884 on-site jobs would represent approximately 1.9 percent of the projected total year 2000-2020 job increase (47,150 added jobs) in San Mateo County and approximately 0.2 percent of the projected year 2020 total of 480,970 jobs in San Mateo County; and approximately 6.8 percent of the projected year 2000-2020 job increase (12,990 added jobs) in Redwood City and approximately 1.2 percent of the projected year 2020 total of 74,990 jobs in the City.

(c) Indirect Multiplier Effects. The additional project jobs on-site could also have an indirect economic "multiplier" effect, generating additional employment in the broader local area as (a) the added income from project wage-earners (employed residents) is cycled through the local and countywide economy, and (b) additional business activity is generated in support of the on-site businesses. New secondary businesses and jobs would not be created immediately; the full secondary employment impact could take 20 years or more to be realized. Because Redwood City does not have a closed economy, some of these secondary jobs could also ultimately occur elsewhere in San Mateo County or the Bay region.

(d) Temporary Construction Phase Employment. The project would also create a substantial number of construction jobs during the projected ten-year construction period.

---

<sup>10</sup>Caltrans District 4.

### **6.3.6 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**Impact 6-1: Project-Related Resident Population Growth.** The project proposes residential development on the project site as well as extension of roads and other infrastructure into the site. The proposed 1,930 housing units would house an estimated on-site total of 4,020 people. Taking into consideration the approximately 110 persons assumed to be currently living on-site, the **net** on-site population increase would be approximately 3,910 persons. This project-related resident population growth has the potential to cause a number of population-related significant adverse environmental effects and also contribute to a number of significant cumulative adverse environmental effects (traffic, public services, noise, and air quality) as described in other sections of this EIR (see chapters 7, 10, 13, and 15), representing a **potentially significant project and cumulative impact** (see criterion 2 in subsection 6.3.1, "Significance Criteria," above).

The estimated net increase in the on-site population of approximately 3,910 persons would represent approximately 0.5 percent of the ABAG-projected year 2020 San Mateo County population total of 795,100, and approximately 3.5 percent of the ABAG-projected year 2020 Redwood City population total of 110,100. The population increase (approximately 3,910 residents) would represent approximately 13.2 percent of the ABAG-projected 2000-to-2020 Redwood City population growth increment of 29,500 persons. These relative project-related population increases would not in themselves constitute a significant adverse environmental impact. However, the added population increments could in turn cause significant project-related impacts and contribute to significant cumulative impacts related to traffic, public services, air quality, noise, and other environmental impacts that are described in corresponding chapters of this EIR.

**Mitigation 6-1.** Implement the mitigation measures identified in other chapters of this EIR related to project population-induced environmental impacts (traffic--chapter 7, public services--chapter 10, noise--chapter 13, and air quality--chapter 15). Implementation of these measures would reduce identified environmental impacts associated with the project-related population increase to a **less-than-significant level**, with the exception of project and cumulative transportation impacts (see chapter 7), project-related and cumulative municipal water service demand (*Impact 10-1*) and long-term regional air emissions (*Impact 15-2*), which after implementation of the associated mitigation measures identified in this EIR, would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

**Project Housing Supply Provisions.** The proposed project would provide approximately 1,930 new housing units, which would result in a local housing supply benefit and provide all of

the City's ABAG-identified fair share need for housing from 1999 to 2006 for "above moderate-income" housing in Redwood City, and, depending on unit affordability, potentially for "moderate-income" housing as well. This potential total would be above and beyond the 19 "moderate-income" units already constructed in Redwood City since 1999. The project contribution to the ABAG-identified fair share need for "very low" and "low" income household has not been established.

The goals, policies, and regulations of the City with respect to housing do not include specific housing affordability requirements for new residential development.

**Mitigation.** The project would have an overall beneficial impact on local housing-for-purchase needs. No project-related conflict with an applicable housing goal or regulation of the City of Redwood City has been identified. No mitigation is necessary.

**Project-Related Loss of Existing On-Site Housing.** Approximately 110 existing on-site "mobile" residential units (including live-aboard boats, recreational vehicles, and a mobile home) would be displaced. In its response to the City's Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this project, BCDC states that the project could create "...impacts to individuals that rely on houseboats and live-aboard boats for affordable housing; a new location for these residences is extremely difficult to find in the Bay Area." BCDC staff also note that live-aboard houseboats displaced by the proposed project which relocate to the Bay without BCDC authorization may become a "serious enforcement issue" for BCDC.<sup>11</sup> Neither of these issues would constitute a direct *environmental* effect under CEQA (see subsection 6.3.1, "Significance Criteria") unless the displacement were to "*necessitat[e] the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.*" However, these nonenvironmental concerns may deserve regional and local policy consideration.

---

<sup>11</sup>Andrea M. Gaut, Coastal Program Analyst, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), written response to Notice of Preparation, received March 28, 2002.

The displacement of the on-site live-aboard boats can also be considered in a local context. One member of Docketown, an adjacent marina that includes up to 100 live-aboard boats, has expressed concerns that the Blomquist Extension project could result in a ten-percent decrease in Docketown live-aboard slips.<sup>12</sup> However, the official Environmental Assessment for the Blomquist Extension states, "The preferred alignments of the proposed bridge overcrossing at Redwood Creek and Blomquist Street extension will cause no displacement of berths at the Docketown Marina."<sup>13</sup> Because the Blomquist Extension is a *public project* (i.e., implemented by public agencies), as mitigation for the loss of eight repair spaces, 31 dryland rental spaces, 40 berth parking spaces, and the remote possibility of one live-aboard berth that would occur with implementation of the Blomquist Extension, the Blomquist Extension Environmental Assessment has called for an associated formal City Relocation Assistance Program, which would include relocation assistance to supplement any increase in rent if any Docketown residents are displaced.<sup>14</sup>

The Marina Shores Village project would be a privately financed and developed project and, therefore, would not be subject to a relocation assistance program. The live-aboard boats that exist in the Docketown community would not be removed or altered as a result of the proposed project or any other pending projects or plans in the area. In addition, the proposed new West Point Marina has been approved for construction at the terminus of Seaport Boulevard. This new 408-berth marina will include 60 live-aboard slips. Therefore, if the proposed Marina Shores Village project were developed, the total (net) cumulative displacement (loss) of live-aboard boats, recreational vehicles, and a mobile home providing housing in the project vicinity would be approximately 50 units.<sup>15</sup> Under CEQA, the displacement of 50 live-aboard boats is

---

<sup>12</sup>James Jonas, Docketown Marina member, written response to "Marina Shores Project Initial Study Checklist Form," March 7, 2002.

<sup>13</sup>State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), prepared by WESCO for the City of Redwood City. Blomquist Street Extension and East Bayshore Realignment Environmental Assessment, 1993, p. 25.

<sup>14</sup>Caltrans and FHWA, p. 44.

<sup>15</sup>The displacement of approximately 110 "mobile" housing units by the proposed project would be partially offset by the gain of 60 live-aboards at West Point Marina, equaling a net displacement of



considered a **less-than-significant environmental impact** because there is no evidence that the displacement would "necessitat[e] the construction of replacement housing elsewhere" (see criterion 3 in subsection 6.3.1, "Significance Criteria," above).

**Mitigation.** No significant impact has been identified; no mitigation is required.

**Impact 6-2: Project-Related Employment Growth.** The office and retail components of the project would ultimately employ roughly 880 people. This project-related local employment growth increment has the potential to result in employment-related environmental effects (traffic, public services, noise, and air quality) as described in corresponding chapters of this EIR (see chapters 7, 10, 13, and 15), representing a **potentially significant project and cumulative impact** (see criterion 2 in subsection 6.3.1, "Significance Criteria," above).

**Mitigation 6-2.** Implement the mitigation measures identified in other chapters of this EIR related to project employment-related environmental impacts (traffic--chapter 7, public services--chapter 10, noise--chapter 13, and air quality--chapter 15). Implementation of these measures would reduce identified environmental impacts associated with the project-related employment increase to a **less-than-significant level**, with the exception of project and cumulative transportation impacts, project-related and cumulative municipal water service demand, and long-term regional air emissions, which after implementation of the associated mitigation measures identified in this EIR, would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

**Project Impact on Jobs/Housing Balance.** The project would provide approximately 1,930 new housing units (or approximately 1,820 net additional units, subtracting the displaced approximately 110 on-site units) and roughly 880 local jobs, i.e., substantially more housing than jobs. As a result, the residential component of the project would assist Redwood City in achieving a better citywide balance between employed residents and jobs and would therefore have a **beneficial effect** on this factor. Currently, people are in-commuting to jobs located in Redwood City, as discussed in subsection 6.1.4(a) herein, and this trend is projected to continue and possibly increase over the next 20 years (see Table 6.4). With implementation of the proposed project, the projected local imbalance of jobs-to-employed-residents would be expected to improve, with an associated decrease in the in-commuting trend. Therefore, there would be a beneficial, and no significant adverse, project impact related to the local jobs/housing balance.

---

approximately 50 "mobile" units (110-60=50) in the project vicinity.

**Mitigation.** No significant impact has been identified; no mitigation is required.