4.11 POPULATION AND HOUSING

This section describes existing population and housing trends in the plan area as well as applicable policies and regulations. Potential impacts to population, housing, and employment resulting from implementation of the New General Plan are described and mitigation measures are provided to address potentially significant impacts.

Information within this section is derived from the Baseline Economic Conditions Report prepared in November 2008 and the Redwood City General Plan Housing Background Report prepared in June 2008. Additional sources are noted where referenced.

4.11.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Population Trends

Over the last century, Redwood City’s population remained fairly constant until the years immediately following World War II as shown on Figure 4.11-1. Since that time, with the exception of the period from 1970 to 1980, the City’s population has steadily increased. The City’s greatest growth period occurred between 1950 and 1960 with an increase of approximately 74 percent. Growth stabilized in the 1970s but increased again in the 1980s, with an increase of about 20 percent between 1980 and 1990. The City’s population increased by 14 percent between 1990 and 2000 and increased 2.5 percent between 2000 and 2008.

As shown in Table 4.11-1, between 1990 and 2008, the City grew by almost 17 percent, as compared to 14 percent growth in San Mateo County as a whole and 28 percent growth for the State of California. The City’s 1990 population of 66,072 increased to over 75,000 by 2000 and approached 78,000 by 2008. According to the 2000 Census, the unincorporated areas within the plan area (including North Fair Oaks, Emerald Lake Hills, and Selby) have a combined total population of approximately 22,400 people.

Table 4.11-1 Population Trends, 1990–2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/County/State</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Total Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>66,072</td>
<td>75,402</td>
<td>77,269</td>
<td>11,197</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>649,623</td>
<td>707,161</td>
<td>739,469</td>
<td>89,846</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>29,760,021</td>
<td>33,871,648</td>
<td>38,049,462</td>
<td>8,289,441</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Population Projections

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) provides demographic projections for jurisdictions in its region, which include Redwood City and San Mateo County. These projections take into account local conditions, including existing conditions and allowable
Source: California Department of Finance Historical Census
Populations of Places, Towns, and Cities in California, 1850-2000
development, the latter as expressed through local planning documents. ABAG’s projections are also informed by wider regional, statewide, and local demographic trends.

As shown in Table 4.11-2 Redwood City’s population is projected to increase by 21.4 percent between 2010 and 2030, while the County’s population would increase by 17.6 percent.

While ABAG provides a population projection for all unincorporated portions of the County combined, no specific projections are available for the North Fair Oaks, Selby, and Emerald Hills neighborhoods that are part of the plan area. ABAG has projected an 8.8 percent growth in the County’s unincorporated areas between 2010 and 2030.

Table 4.11-2 Population Projections, 2010–2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/County</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Total Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>76,100</td>
<td>84,400</td>
<td>92,400</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>733,300</td>
<td>801,300</td>
<td>862,600</td>
<td>129,300</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Housing Trends

Housing stock is defined as the collection of all housing units located within Redwood City. Table 4.11-3 summarizes housing stock growth between 1990 and 2008 in the City and the County, which shows a relatively modest increase in housing, indicative of the predominantly built out character of the City. The 29,276 housing units reported in 2008 represents a one percent increase from the 28,921 housing units reported in 2000. As a comparison, housing units increased by nine percent between 1990 and 2000.

Table 4.11-3 Housing Units, 1990–2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/County</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Total Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>26,847</td>
<td>28,921</td>
<td>29,276</td>
<td>2,429</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>251,782</td>
<td>260,576</td>
<td>268,181</td>
<td>16,519</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As of 2007, approximately 44 percent of all housing units in the City were built prior to 1960, and another 32 percent of the housing stock was constructed between 1960 and 1979. In sum, more than three quarters of all housing in the City is approximately 30 years old or greater. Only about 12 percent of the City’s housing units were built between 1990 and 2000. The age of the City’s housing stock reflects the fact that Redwood City built out quickly following World War II. Moreover, this reflects a potential concern insofar as housing units over 30 years of age typically require some form of major rehabilitation, such as a new roof, foundation work, or similar structural repair or replacement.
Table 4.11-4 lists the housing characteristics and trends in the City between 2000 and 2007. As shown on the table, the total number of housing units increased very little during this period, with the largest gain (3.1 percent) in multi-family 5+ units. As of 2007, approximately 59 percent of the City’s housing stock was single-family (detached or attached). About 38 percent of all housing units were in multi-family developments. About 3 percent of the remaining housing units were mobile homes.

Table 4.11–4 Housing Characteristics and Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>2000 Number of Units</th>
<th>2000 Percent of Total</th>
<th>2007 Number of Units</th>
<th>2007 Percent of Total</th>
<th>2000-2007 Percent Change in Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>13,493</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>13,554</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>3,653</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3,656</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Single-Family</td>
<td>17,146</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>17,210</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family 2-4 Units</td>
<td>2,596</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2,623</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family 5+ Units</td>
<td>8,346</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8,610</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Multi-Family</td>
<td>10,942</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11,233</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Homes, Trailer, and Other</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total</td>
<td>28,921</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>29,276</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A household is defined by the Census as all persons who occupy a housing unit, which may include families, single persons, and unrelated persons sharing a housing unit. Persons residing in group quarters such as dormitories, retirement homes, or prisons are not considered households. In 2000 there were 28,060 households in Redwood City, which increased to 28,631 in 2010. The average household size in 2000 was 2.63 persons per household, which increased slightly in 2010 to 2.67 persons per household.\(^1\) Table 4.11-5 summarizes household growth between 2000 and 2010.

Table 4.11–5 Households, 2000–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/County</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>28,060</td>
<td>28,332</td>
<td>28,631</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>254,104</td>
<td>259,813</td>
<td>264,422</td>
<td>10,318</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABAG 2009, CA Department of Finance, 2010

\(^1\) California Department of Finance, City/County Population and Housing Estimates, May 2010
The vacancy rate is one measurement of the availability of housing within a community. Some amount of vacancy is normal to allow for people to move from one place to another as individual circumstances change. A healthy vacancy rate is considered to be 2 to 3 percent for ownership housing and five to six percent for rental housing. In 2000, the US Census determined that the overall vacancy rate in the City was about 3 percent. In 2010 the California Department of Finance identified the overall vacancy rate in the City at 2.3 percent.

**Housing Projections**

**Table 4.11-6** summarizes the ABAG housing projections from year 2010 to 2030 for both the City and the County. ABAG projects that between 2010 and 2020, the total number of households in the City will increase by 9.1 percent (from 28,631 households to 31,400 households). In 2030, a total of 34,540 households are projected, representing a 21 percent increase from 2010. The number of households in the County is projected to increase by 18 percent between 2010 and 2030.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/County</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Total Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>28,631</td>
<td>31,400</td>
<td>34,540</td>
<td>5,909</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>264,422</td>
<td>287,350</td>
<td>310,970</td>
<td>46,548</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABAG, 2009. CA Department of Finance, 2010

**Employment**

The City has been an important sub-regional job center. As documented in detail within the *Baseline Economic Conditions Report* prepared in association with the New General Plan, the City as of 2008 provided approximately 52,000 jobs. An additional 5,700 jobs were located in the sphere of influence neighborhoods for a total of about 58,000 jobs in the plan area as a whole. This figure represents approximately 16 percent of all jobs in San Mateo County as of 2008.

The employment base of the City is relatively diversified, with no single employment sector comprising more than 21 percent of all jobs located in the City. The three greatest employment sectors in the City include information technology (21 percent of all jobs in the City), professional, scientific and technical services (16 percent of all jobs in the City), and health care (12 percent). The *Baseline Economic Conditions Report* provides a detailed assessment of existing conditions for so-called “employment zones” within the City and plan area. As noted in an updated memorandum, despite the economic downturn there have been job gains in the knowledge-based industries (increase of 3.4 percent), while the retail and leisure industries have experienced a slight decline (3.8 percent). The health care industry has remained steady throughout the recession experiencing a job gain of 21.7 percent from 2006 to the first quarter of 2009. This
substantial gain in employment is largely due to the opening of the Stanford Outpatient Center in February of 2009, which added 744 employees. 2

As shown in Table 4.11-7, the City’s active labor force between 1990 and 2000 increased by approximately 50 percent from 20,779 to 41,482 individuals. During the same period, unemployment remained relatively unchanged at a rate of about 3 to 4 percent. Between 2000 and 2009, the active labor force showed only a 5 percent increase from 41,482 to 43,600 individuals, while the unemployment rate nearly doubled from 3.3 percent to 5.9 percent during the same period. By the end of 2009 the unemployment rate had increased to 8.6 percent.3

Table 4.11–7 Employment Rates 1990–2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Possible Labor Force</td>
<td>26,432</td>
<td>59,567</td>
<td>n/a(^{A})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Labor Force</td>
<td>20,779</td>
<td>41,482</td>
<td>43,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>20,707</td>
<td>41,470</td>
<td>n/a(^{A})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>19,888</td>
<td>40,100</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Unemployment Rate)</td>
<td>(3.9%)</td>
<td>(3.3%)</td>
<td>(5.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Forces</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>n/a(^{A})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{A}\) The CA EDD does not provide detailed information for the sub-categories included in the US Census.

Employment Projections

ABAG projections indicate that the number of jobs in the City will increase by approximately 30 percent between 2010 and 2030, as shown in Table 4.11-8. During the same period, jobs are expected to increase countywide by approximately 36.6 percent.

Table 4.11–8 Employment Projections, 2010–2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redwood City (Excluding Sphere of Influence Area)</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Total Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>51,230</td>
<td>58,520</td>
<td>66,600</td>
<td>15,370</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Mateo County</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>346,320</td>
<td>404,400</td>
<td>473,290</td>
<td>126,970</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2 Strategic Economics, Update of Employment Data, February 2010.
3 Strategic Economics, Update of Employment Data, February 2010.
4.11.2 REGULATORY SETTING

Housing Element

State law (Government Code Section 65580 et seq.) enacted in 1969 requires cities and counties to update the housing element of their General Plan every five years. The Housing Element is intended to regulate available housing supply through planning and zoning. State law mandates that local governments adequately plan to meet the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community. The law acknowledges that, in order for the private market to adequately address housing needs and demand, local governments must adopt land use plans and regulatory systems which provide opportunities for housing development. The State requires the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to review local housing elements for compliance with the law and to report its findings to the local government.

To fulfill its oversight role, HCD develops Regional Housing Needs Plans (RHNPs). HCD is required to allocate a region’s share of the statewide housing need to the appropriate Council of Governments (COG). The relevant COG for the San Francisco Bay Area is ABAG. The COG in turn divides the region’s total allocation among its member jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction is assigned a “Regional Housing Needs Allocation” or “RHNA” number. This number is intended to represent each jurisdiction’s “fair share” of new housing units. Jurisdictions are not required to actually provide new units but instead must demonstrate (through the housing element) that the RHNA number could be achieved when taking into account a jurisdiction’s amount of available housing sites and its regulatory framework. Each jurisdiction’s housing element is in turn evaluated by HCD for its ability to meet the RHNA number. The RHNA number is typically subdivided by household income levels (ranging from “above moderate” to very low income).

For the 2009 – 2014 reporting period, San Mateo County as a whole was allocated a total of 15,378 housing units. The City’s RHNA number for this period is 1,856 housing units, subdivided by household income level.

California Relocation Assistance Act

The California Relocation Assistance Act (Government Code Section 7260 et seq.) establishes uniform policies to provide for the fair and equitable treatment of people displaced from their homes or businesses as a direct result of state and/or local government projects or programs. The California Relocation Assistance Act requires that comparable replacement housing be made available to displaced persons within a reasonable period of time prior to the displacement. Displaced persons or businesses are assured payment for their acquired property at fair market value. Relocation assistance in the form of advisory assistance and financial benefits would be provided at the local level. This includes aid in finding a new home location, payments to help cover moving costs, and additional payments for certain other costs.
Homeowners and Private Property Protection Act

In 2008, California voters approved Proposition 99, the Homeowners and Private Property Protection Act, which amended the California Constitution so that local governments are prohibited from using eminent domain authority to acquire an owner-occupied residence for the purposes of conveying it to a private recipient, with limited exceptions. Proposition 99 applies only to owner-occupied residences. Cities may still use eminent domain authority to convey multi-family and non-residential property to other private parties.

Project Consistency Analysis

The New General Plan includes a new Housing Element, which was submitted to HCD for review in April 2009. As of December 2009, HCD has indicated it would be able to certify the Housing Element if the City adopts the proposed draft version as part of the New General Plan. The new Housing Element demonstrates that the City has more than adequate vacant or redevelopment sites to meet the RHNA number. Specifically, the new Housing Element demonstrates that a total of 5,912 housing units could be constructed during the lifespan of the Housing Element. In each income category, the new Housing Element exceeds the RHNA requirement. It is therefore anticipated that HCD will certify the Housing Element, finding it consistent with all pertinent requirements.

4.11.3 Thresholds of Significance

Redwood City has not established local CEQA significance thresholds as described in Section 15064.7 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, significance determinations are from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. A significant impact could occur if development allowed by the New General Plan would:

a) 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).

b) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

c) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

4.11.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This discussion focuses on the direct growth in population and housing associated with the New General Plan and analyzes the potential community impacts, including the displacement of homes and relocation of current residents. The New General Plan’s

---

potential to induce population growth is also assessed in terms of the creation of new employment opportunities. The purpose of this section is to provide a general understanding of how adoption of the New General Plan could affect population growth and housing demand. The New General Plan’s effect on population and housing is analyzed for the following reasons:

- Population growth allowed by the New General Plan could create indirect impacts, such as increased traffic, air quality, noise and increased demand for public services. CEQA requires the evaluation of indirect impacts. These impacts are discussed in the respective sections of this Draft EIR relating to those issues.

- Understanding the impacts to population and housing from adoption of the New General Plan will help assess the adequacy of the policies intended to provide a balance between employment growth and the availability of housing to meet the needs of current and future workers.

- Understanding the impacts to housing demand from adoption of the New General Plan will help assess the adequacy of local policies intended to provide additional affordable housing for low- and moderate-income households.

Project Impacts

**Impact 4.11-1: Adoption of the New General Plan would allow development of up to 9,103 additional dwelling units in the plan area and potentially create 28,002 jobs, which would directly and/or indirectly induce population growth. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

Adoption of the New General Plan would allow for substantial increases in plan area population and employment numbers. The New General Plan would allow for an approximately 24.4 percent increase in housing and 48.2 percent increase in employment over existing levels. As shown in Table 4.11-9, the New General Plan could result in an increase of 9,103 housing units and 28,002 jobs in the plan area.

By 2030, this increase in housing and employment would result in a population increase of approximately 14,942 people in the City, and 1,876 people in the SOI, for a total of 16,819 people in the plan area.

For comparative purposes, this population increase would be approximately 16.8 percent over 2008 levels, and less than 1 percent greater than ABAG 2030 projections for the area. The population increase is anticipated to be slightly above ABAG projections because ABAG makes its projections based in part on a community’s existing general plan. If the New General Plan is adopted by the City, it is anticipated that subsequent revisions of ABAG projections would more closely reflect the anticipated population growth of the New General Plan. However, the New General Plan provides for the population capacity anticipated after 2030 through the implementation of various policies and implementation programs, which control the timing of development, encourage mixed-use development, require infrastructure concurrency, and encourage a healthy job-housing balance. Specifically, Policy BE-22.2, as detailed in Appendix A, would set forth a series of performance based measures against which new development proposals would
be weighed, including infrastructure availability and capacity. The following additional policies and implementation programs would also offset potential effects related to population increases.

Table 4.11–9 Anticipated Development Under New General Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>Sphere of Influence</td>
<td>Plan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 (existing)</td>
<td>28,522</td>
<td>8,659</td>
<td>37,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 Total Development Under New General Plan</td>
<td>36,749</td>
<td>9,535</td>
<td>46,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated New Development Under New General Plan</td>
<td>8,227</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>9,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison: 2030 ABAG Projections</td>
<td>34,540</td>
<td>Not computed</td>
<td>Not computed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hogle-Ireland, Inc, 2009; ABAG 2009; California Department of Finance, 2008,

The most critical of these is Policy BE-22.5 and related Program BE-22, as shown in Appendix A, which would track new residential and non-residential development and link such new development to available water resources. These would establish a requirement for concurrency with water availability. As discussed further in Section 4.15, Utilities, at present, there is uncertainty about the availability of water to serve development allowed by the New General Plan. The policy and implementation program would require the City to establish a system of “real time” monitoring of new development permits and associated water system demands. Each newly issued building permit would thus be subtracted from the City’s “bank” of available water so that building permit issuance would not exceed available water resources.

Policies BE-41.1 and BE-41.2 of the Built Environment Chapter of the New General Plan, detailed in Appendix A, provide recommendations to improve the distribution/system capacity of wastewater services in order to meet the requirements of the anticipated growth in the plan area. Programs BE-134 and BE-136 also call for the completion of a Water Master Plan and the implementation and updating of the City’s Sewer Master Plan. As of April 2010, the City’s Sewer Master Plan was last updated in August 2008.

In regards to maintaining an appropriate job-housing balance, Program BE-24 would consider developing a definition of a healthy job-housing balance for the City and Program BE-93 would initiate collaboration between local industries and local education institutions to develop job training within the plan area.
While the New General Plan would allow increased residential and commercial
development in the plan area, the New General Plan anticipates and plans for this growth
through policies and implementation programs. Further strengthening of Program BE-22, per Mitigation Measure 4.11-1, is recommended to ensure that new development
would not be able to proceed without assurances of water availability.

**Mitigation Measure 4.11-1**: Modify Program BE-22 to read as follows:

Track the number of new residential units and non-residential development and
link the limit new development to available water resources.

**Significance After Mitigation**: By tiering allowable population and development
increases to available water resources, the inclusion of Mitigation Measure 4.11-1 would
reduce the New General Plan’s impact regarding substantial population growth to a less
than significant level.

**Impact 4.11-2**: Adoption of the New General Plan would promote infill
development and mixed-use land uses which could result in limited
displacement of existing housing and people. (Less than Significant)

Adoption of the New General Plan would not result in the direct displacement of housing,
businesses, or people, since the New General Plan would only introduce land use
designations and associated development standards rather than individual development
projects.

Additionally, the overall housing stock of the plan area could increase with adoption of the
New General Plan. Much of the residential areas within the plan area would be protected
and preserved, and some higher density residential neighborhoods adjacent to Downtown
would be re-designated to a lower density to protect historic structures. As most of the
new development would occur through infill, adaptive reuse, or new mixed-use
development in the Downtown, it is not anticipated that substantial numbers of housing
or people would be displaced and that the New General Plan, therefore, would not
necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Implementation of Program BE-9 of the New General Plan would help ensure that new
growth is channeled into priority development areas, which are identified in the New
Housing Element as the most suitable locations city-wide for higher density residential
and mixed-use development.

Furthermore, to the extent any such existing residential properties are sold on the free
market by current owners with the intent of demolishing existing housing in order to build
new housing at a higher density, significant displacement effects would not occur. Such a
sale of an existing property and its redevelopment at a higher density would not constitute
displacement; the seller of any such property would benefit from the sale of such property
and/or its potential redevelopment. In situations where all of the above conditions are in
place except that the housing is currently renter-occupied, a limited displacement effect
could occur to the few individuals that were renting the sold property. However, it is
anticipated that the City would be able to absorb the potential few temporarily displaced renters with its existing stock of multi-family residential units and renter-occupied homes.

With adherence to and implementation of the New General Plan policies and implementation programs, impacts related to the displacement of existing housing and people would be less than significant. No additional mitigation is required. Individual developments within the plan area will be required to undergo project-specific environmental review and may include a relocation analysis and plan in accordance with federal and state requirements. If project-level significant impacts are identified, specific mitigation measures will be required under CEQA.