

## 4.11 Population, Housing and Employment

This section identifies and evaluates the potential impacts related to population, housing, and employment that could potentially result from development under the Inner Harbor Specific Plan.<sup>1</sup> This section describes and quantifies past and existing trends, as well as projected conditions at the citywide, countywide, and regional level, in addition to projections for the Plan Area. This section also presents demographic information specific to the Harbor View project, which is located largely in the Plan Area. The demographic information presented in this section provides the statistical basis for determining population and employment-related inputs and/or impacts in other sections of this Draft EIR. As detailed in Section 4.11-3 of this section, the baseline conditions for the analyses in this EIR are as of November 2014.

### 4.11.1 Environmental Setting

Long-term projections for Redwood City by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) indicate potential for substantial growth of housing, households, and population, as detailed in **Table 4.11-1**. The ABAG projections reflect market factors as well as policy direction to increase the share of regional development that occurs in the Bay Area's major cities and in higher-density, urban locations that have good accessibility and are served by transit. The rates of growth of households and population in Redwood City are forecast to exceed the rates of growth for San Mateo County and the Bay Area overall.

## Population and Housing

### *Population*

There are currently approximately 80,300 people living in Redwood City, about 11 percent of the total population of San Mateo County (745,400), and about one percent of the total Bay Area population (7.5 million), as shown in Table 4.11-1. The population of the Bay Area, which consists of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano and Sonoma counties, is approximately 7.46 million, and is growing, with approximately 26 percent growth expected to occur by 2040. Population growth in Redwood City and San Mateo County from by 2040 is similarly expected to increase by approximately 27 and 22 percent, respectively. (ABAG, 2013)

---

<sup>1</sup> CEQA *Guidelines* Appendix G (environmental factor *XIII. Population and Housing*, item "A") refers to population growth resulting from *new businesses, as well as homes*. Therefore, the topics of employment and its relation to population growth are addressed in this Draft EIR chapter.

**TABLE 4.11-1  
 ESTIMATED DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FOR REDWOOD CITY, SAN MATEO COUNTY AND BAY AREA – 2010 TO 2040**

	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	Percent Change, 2015-2040
<b>City or Redwood City</b>								
Total population (residents)	76,815	80,300	84,000	87,800	91,900	96,300	100,800	<b>25.5%</b>
Total household population	75,268	78,700	82,300	86,000	89,900	94,000	98,400	<b>25.0%</b>
Total households	27,957	29,410	30,920	32,370	33,880	35,340	36,860	<b>25.3%</b>
Persons per household (pph)	2.69	2.68	2.66	2.66	2.65	2.66	2.67	<b>-0.4% pph</b>
Total jobs	58,080	64,160	70,960	72,090	73,330	75,340	77,480	<b>20.8%</b>
Total employed residents	36,460	39,630	43,060	44,170	45,310	46,940	48,630	<b>22.7%</b>
<b>San Mateo County</b>								
Total population (residents)	718,451	745,400	775,100	805,600	836,100	869,300	904,400	<b>21.3%</b>
Total household population	709,598	736,500	765,400	795,800	825,400	857,700	892,000	<b>21.1%</b>
Total households	257,837	267,150	277,200	286,790	296,280	305,390	315,100	<b>17.9%</b>
Persons per household (pph)	2.75	2.76	2.76	2.77	2.79	2.81	2.83	<b>2.5% pph</b>
Total jobs	345,190	374,940	407,550	414,240	421,500	432,980	445,070	<b>18.7%</b>
Total employed residents	342,060	368,790	398,220	406,310	413,740	425,830	438,770	<b>19.0%</b>
<b>Bay Area</b>								
Total population (residents)	7,150,739	7,461,400	7,786,800	8,134,000	8,496,800	8,889,000	9,299,100	<b>24.6%</b>
Total household population	7,003,059	7,307,400	7,623,700	7,961,900	8,313,900	8,690,400	9,084,800	<b>24.3%</b>
Total households	2,608,023	2,720,410	2,837,680	2,952,910	3,072,920	3,188,330	3,308,090	<b>21.6%</b>
Persons per household (pph)	2.69	2.69	2.69	2.7	2.71	2.73	2.75	<b>2.2% pph</b>
Total jobs	3,268,680	3,547,310	3,849,790	3,949,620	4,052,020	4,198,400	4,350,070	<b>22.6%</b>
Total employed residents								
SOURCE: ABAG, 2013								

### **Plan Area Population**

Residents live along the northwest edge of the Plan Area, along Redwood Creek, in the area known as the Docktown Marina. The marina comprises approximately 100 watercraft, about 70 of which are used as private liveaboards. The number of watercraft within the Docktown Marina changes over time. As previously described in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, the analysis in this EIR conservatively assumes all 100 watercraft in Docktown are liveaboards, and applying the household density discussed below for the Plan Area (1.4 persons per liveboard), an estimated population of 140 persons reside in the Plan Area (only 27 of which were reported by the 2010 U.S. Census.<sup>2,3</sup> This estimated population does not include individuals in group living quarters, specifically the 206 inmates at the San Mateo County Jail. This existing group living population or the increase that will be accommodated in the new County Replacement Jail Facility under construction, is not considered in this population analysis of the Specific Plan or Harbor View project because this population will not change as a result of development under the Specific Plan or development of the Harbor View project.<sup>4</sup> (BAE, 2014) The living quarters population in the existing and the new County Jail facilities under construction are part of the background cumulative conditions.

### **Households and Household Density**

A household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit.<sup>5</sup> Table 4.11-1 shows that the average household size in Redwood City is 2.69 persons per household. The City's households make up approximately 11 percent of the total County households (267,150), which has similar average household size of 2.75 persons per household.

The average household size in the Plan Area is substantially smaller than the City and County rate at approximately 1.4 persons per household (liveboard watercraft). This suggests that there are a significant number of single-person households. No housing other than the liveaboards and the group living quarters in the County Jail exists on the Harbor View project site or anywhere else in the Plan Area. (BAE, 2014)

### **Housing Units and Vacancy Rates**

A housing unit is a house, an apartment, mobile home, group of rooms or a single room occupied as separate living quarters. As summarized in **Table 4.11-2**, the City has approximately 30,072 housing units, which is the result of a steady increase of approximately 3.0 percent (or 905 units)

---

<sup>2</sup> To ensure a conservative analysis, all berths are modeled as the more sensitive and intensive residential use because the distribution and total number of residential and non-residential watercraft within the existing marina has and continues to change frequently over time. As of mid-2015, there are approximately 87 watercraft within the Docktown Marina.

<sup>3</sup> The population living in households in the Inner Harbor Plan Area in 2010 based on U.S. Census data was approximately 27 people (BAE, 2014). Household population excludes persons living in group facilities, such as the County Correctional Facility.

<sup>4</sup> The existing Redwood City Police Station and San Mateo County Replacement Jail Facility are located within the Plan Area, but will not be removed or affected by development under the Specific Plan. These existing uses – specifically their associated group living residents for purposes of this analysis – are factored into the cumulative analysis background.

<sup>5</sup> People not living in households are classified as living in group quarters.

over the past five years, and an increase of nearly 4.0 percent (or 1,151 units) since 2000. This growth mirrors the housing stock trend in the County. There are approximately 274,612 total units in the County. In both the City and the County, vacancy rates have remained flat since 2010 when notable increases occurred in the preceding decade 2000 to 2010.

As summarized in Table 4.11-2, the City has steadily increased its housing production, developing approximately 1,151 units in the past 15 years. As of 2014, approximately 4,081 units are in the “pipeline” (i.e., proposed, recently approved, or under construction) to be developed in the City, considering the cumulative development context for this EIR shown in Table 4.0-1 in Section 4.0.4, *Cumulative Development*, of this EIR. This housing development trend is consistent with the growth envisioned for the City in its General Plan, including specifically in the “Redwood Creek/Harbor Center” neighborhood where the Inner Harbor Specific Plan Area is located.

**TABLE 4.11-2  
 CHANGES IN HOUSING UNITS AND VACANCY RATE – REDWOOD CITY AND SAN MATEO COUNTY  
 2000, 2010 AND 2015**

	2000	2010	Change 2000-2010	2015	Change 2010-2015	Change 2000-2015
<b>City of Redwood City</b>						
Total Housing Units	28,921	29,167	0.9%	30,072	3.1%	<b>4.0%</b>
Occupied Housing Units	28,060	27,957	-0.4%	28,828	3.1%	<b>2.7%</b>
Vacancy Rate	3.0%	4.1%	1.1 pts	4.1%	0	<b>0.9 pts</b>
<b>San Mateo County</b>						
Total Housing Units	260,578	271,031	4.0%	274,612	1.3%	<b>5.4%</b>
Occupied Housing Units	254,104	257,837	1.5%	261,284	1.3%	<b>2.8%</b>
Vacancy Rate	2.5%	4.9%	2.4 pts	4.9%	0	<b>2.4 pts</b>

SOURCE: CDOF, 2012 (2000), 2015a (2010), 2015b (2015)

## Employment

The positive employment trends in Redwood City aligned directly with those of the County and the Bay Area. The number of total jobs in Redwood City as of 2015 was approximately 64,160. Between 2000 and 2015, total jobs in the City increased by 10.4 percent (6,080 jobs), and the current total is projected to increase by approximately 20 percent (13,320 jobs) by 2040. (Table 4.11-1)

The County has 374,940 total jobs. Between 2000 and 2015, total jobs in the City increased by nearly 9 percent (29,750 jobs), and the current total is also projected to increase by approximately 21 percent (70,130 jobs) by 2040. The Bay Area job trends also match these changes over the past five years and projected to 2040, with approximately 4.4 million total jobs estimated in the Bay Area. (Table 4.11-1)

San Mateo County's unemployment rate was 8.7 percent in 2010, improving to 5.3 percent in April 2013 (BAE, 2014) and then estimated at 5.0 in March 2014 (EDD, 2014a). The County has the second best (lowest) unemployment rate in all Bay Area Counties, second only to Marin County with 4.7 percent. The City's unemployment rate has experienced similar declines. The unemployment rate for California peaked at 12.4 percent in 2010 then declined to 8.4 percent in August 2013 (BAE, 2014).

### Plan Area Employment

Employment that currently exists in the Plan Area is associated with the Women's Jail and Work Furlough Facility and Maple Street Shelter, which will be incorporated in the new County jail under construction in the proposed Public Facilities (PF) district, which contains existing uses to which the Specific Plan does not propose changes. (See Figure 3-3 in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of this EIR.) The Bair Island Aquatic Center (BIAC) exists in the Plan Area and is a 100 percent volunteer organization not considered to have employees for purposes of this analysis.

At 2014 baseline conditions for preparation of this EIR, employment also existed at building and lumber supply businesses in the eastern part of the Plan Area (in the proposed Inner Harbor-2 [IH-2] district where most of the Harbor View project will occur) (see Figure 3-5 in Chapter 3, *Project Description*). Relevant to the Harbor View project site only, employment is also associated with another existing building and lumber supply business at Blomquist Street and Seaport Boulevard. Each of these building materials-related properties has been recently purchased by the Harbor View project sponsor and most have ceased operation. For the most conservative analysis of potential growth resulting from the Specific Plan or the Harbor View project, no existing employment in the Plan Area and Harbor View project site is considered.<sup>6</sup>

### General Plan Growth Assumptions and ABAG Projections

The information presented above describes the trend of growth occurring and projected for the City of Redwood City, based largely on regional projections data published by ABAG in its *Projections 2013*. ABAG's methodology considered existing and planned land use data provided by local jurisdictions (typically assumptions underlying the jurisdictions general plan) in formulating local and regional projections. Therefore, the growth envisioned in Redwood City's 2010 General Plan is generally reflected in the projections in Table 4.11-1.

The plans, policies, and descriptive contents of Redwood City's 2010 General Plan indicate the general framework and direction the City is pursuing regarding its future, growth between 2010 and 2030. **Table 4.11-3** shows the theoretical amount of development (anticipated housing, population, and employment) that was assumed could occur within the General Plan area in that 20-year planning horizon, based on land use policy and associated densities and intensities the

<sup>6</sup> Although existing businesses operated on the Harbor View project when preparation of this EIR started in 2014, the analysis throughout is conservative in that it does not subtract out the existing traffic generated by the building and lumber supply businesses as uses to be removed. This is demonstrated in Table 3-2 in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, and in the vehicle trip generation summaries in Tables 4.14-7 and 4.14-23 in Section 4.14, *Transportation and Traffic*.

City assigned to properties it considered viable for development or redevelopment in the General Plan area.

As shown in Table 4.11-3, the General Plan anticipated population would increase by about 19 percent over 2008 levels; households would increase by about 29 percent, and the number of jobs would increase by about 48 percent. Although the respective periods for the General Plan growth versus ABAG growth shown below are not the same, it is reasonable to compare these rates of change to present a qualitative comparative assessment upon which assess the effects of the Specific Plan growth and the Harbor View project growth. Overall, the General Plan anticipated somewhat stronger growth than compared to the current ABAG projections (*Projections 2013*) to 2040.

**TABLE 4.11-3  
 CITY OF REDWOOD ANTICIPATED 2008-2030 GROWTH UNDER THE 2010 GENERAL PLAN AND  
 2015-2040 REGIONAL PROJECTIONS <sup>A</sup>**

	2008 <sup>b</sup>	2015	2030	2040	General Plan Growth: Percent Change 2008-2030	ABAG Projections: Percent Change 2015-2040
<b>General Plan Growth</b>						
Population	77,071	-	92,013	-	19%	-
Households	28,522	-	36,749	-	29%	-
Employment	52,300	-	77,623	-	48%	-
<b>ABAG Projections</b>						
Population	-	80,300	-	100,800	-	26%
Households	-	29,410	-	36,860	-	25%
Employment	-	64,160	-	77,480	-	21%

<sup>a</sup> Redwood City City Limits

<sup>b</sup> Baseline year for the 2010 Redwood City General Plan

SOURCE: Redwood City General Plan EIR, 2010; ABAG Projections 2013

## 4.11.2 Regulatory Setting

### Redwood City General Plan

The *Built Environment Element* and the *Housing Element* of the General Plan include the following policies specific to the Specific Plan and Harbor View project site. Policies listed below that are also considered land use policies are addressed in Section 4.9, *Land Use and Planning*, of this Draft EIR.

- Policy H-3.2: Facilitate a variety of housing choices, offering diversity in types, ownership, and sizes, including options for mixed-use housing, transit-oriented developments, and live-work housing.
- Policy BE-2.4: Provide opportunities for housing development at a range of densities and housing types that provide various choices for current and future residents.

- Policy BE-10.2: Allow for a diversity of unique housing types, including floating homes and live-aboard boats. Consult with interested stakeholders to enhance existing floating communities and to establish floating community best practices and standards.

### 4.11.3 Project Baseline

Baseline conditions reflect the condition of the Plan Area and Harbor View project site as they existed at the time of the issuance of the Notice of Preparation issued on November 6, 2014, as described above in *the Environmental Setting*. Data available from the primary sources used in this section, ABAG and the California State Department of Finance (CDOF), in data reported in 2015, reflecting year 2014 conditions (all or in part).

### 4.11.4 Significance Criteria

Based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, the Project would cause significant adverse impacts to population and housing if it 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 existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or
- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

### Approach to Analysis

To establish historic and baseline conditions relevant to the potential effects of development under the Specific Plan and development of the Harbor View project, this analysis uses published sources of demographic data and projections including but not limited to *ABAG Projections 2013*, the U.S. Census, State Department of Finance, and California Employment Development Department.

The analysis quantifies the population, housing, and employment changes resulting from the Specific Plan (maximum theoretical buildout scenario) and the Harbor View project. Those totals are added to baseline conditions to show the effect on existing conditions. Further, this assessment compares how the increased growth affects growth projected in the General Plan and in *ABAG Projections* which will demonstrate the extent to which growth from the Specific Plan and the project was anticipated and/or would accommodate already forecasted growth. The analysis also evaluates if new and extended infrastructure proposed for the Plan Area or the Harbor View project site was already anticipated or would facilitate unplanned growth.

## 4.11.5 Program-Level Impacts of the Inner Harbor Specific Plan

### ***Induce Population Growth***

**Impact POP-1.SP: Adoption and development under the Specific Plan could induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure (Criterion a). (Less than Significant)**

#### **Existing Growth Assumptions**

Development under the Specific Plan would result in up to 1,211 new residents and 4,880 new employees in the Plan Area directly associated with the 550 new housing units (including 100 watercraft used as private liveaboards) and approximately 1.24 million square feet of new non-residential space, as specified in the maximum theoretical buildout scenario of the Specific Plan (see Table 3-1 in Chapter 3, *Project Description*). Residential population includes permanent nighttime residents, and employment population is primarily daytime persons working in the Plan Area.

Some level of population growth in the Plan Area was anticipated in Redwood City's General Plan maximum growth assumptions and is supported and encouraged by numerous General Plan policies. The City has prepared the Specific Plan as part of its implementation of the General Plan, which includes the overarching and specific direction that the City prepare a master plan for the Redwood Creek/Harbor Center area. As described below, the focus of the master plan includes activities that would attract daytime and nighttime population to the Plan Area:

*The master plan should focus on placemaking, "destination uses," design, trails and connections, and public infrastructure requirements. A Master Plan for the Redwood Creek/ Harbor Center area will strengthen the east/west connection from Downtown to the San Francisco Bay, and create a new destination for residents and visitors to Redwood City. The Redwood Creek/Harbor Center will act as a complement to Downtown; as a destination and a fundamental part of the cohesive image of Redwood City.*

#### **Direct Inducement of Growth**

The Specific Plan aligns with goals, policies, and proposed land use designations in the General Plan that are intended to promote transformation of the Redwood Creek/Harbor Center area from primarily industrial uses to high-density, pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use development with a focus on waterfront activity.

The Specific Plan and corresponding amendments to the General Plan (and Zoning) would fully accommodate the density (residential units per land area) and intensity (non-residential floor area per land area) of development under the Specific Plan. Key General Plan policies and further discussion about the nature of land uses and development envisioned for the Plan Area, and how the proposed Specific Plan compares to that vision, is presented in Section 4.9. *Land Use and Planning* of this EIR.

Relevant to this question of substantial population growth, **Table 4.11-4** shows potential growth generated by development under the Specific Plan compared to development assumptions under the General Plan. As shown, estimated growth under the proposed Specific Plan would result in less residential growth and more employee growth than envisioned under the General Plan for the Plan Area. The Specific Plan would generate 1,211 residents in the Plan Area (982 fewer than the General Plan) and would generate 4,880 employees (1,706 more than the General Plan).

**TABLE 4.11-4  
COMPARATIVE PLAN AREA GROWTH (RESIDENTS AND EMPLOYEES) SPECIFIC PLAN AND  
GENERAL PLAN**

Land Use Designation	Residential /Liveaboard (Units)	Office (Sq.Ft.)	Retail (Sq.Ft.)	Light Industrial (Sq.Ft.)	Total Growth
<b>Maximum General Plan Capacity</b>					
Mixed-use Waterfront Neighborhood (MU-WF) <sup>a</sup>	892	271,950	116,550		
Industrial Light (LI)				741,400	
Open Space Preservation (OS)					
Open Space Preservation (OS-SFB)					
	<b>892<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>271,950</b>	<b>116,550</b>	<b>741,400</b>	
<i>Residents</i>	2,193	-			2,193
<i>Employees</i>	-	1,088	233	1,853	3,174
					<b>5,367</b>
<b>Maximum Theoretical Capacity – Specific Plan</b>					
Inner Harbor-1 (IH-1),	370	240,000	25,000		
Inner Harbor-2 (IH-2)	80	940,000			
Water Dependent Development-1 (WD-1)		14,000	5,000		
Water Dependent Development-2 (WD-2)	100 (100) <sup>c</sup>	6,000	10,000		
Open Space-Tidal (OS-T)					
Open Space-Wetlands (OS-W)					
Open Space-Land (OS-L)					
	<b>550 (450)<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>1,200,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>		
<i>Residents</i>	1,211				1,211
<i>Employees</i>	-	4,800	80		4,880
					<b>6,091<sup>d</sup></b>
<b>Difference</b>	(982)	3,712	(153)	(1,853)	<b>724</b>
<b>Percent Change</b>	(44.8%)	341.2%	(65.7%)	(100.0%)	<b>(13.5%)</b>

<sup>a</sup> Non-Residential square foot split between office and retail, applying same ratio applied to total office or retail use.

<sup>b</sup> Includes watercraft used as private residences (liveaboards).

<sup>c</sup> No net change in the existing number of liveaboards assumed.

<sup>d</sup> For purpose of the conservative analysis in this EIR, no existing population in the Plan Area would be removed, and no onsite employment exists.

NOTES: Public Facility (PF) uses are excluded from the Specific Plan Maximum Theoretical Buildout scenario as, like in the General Plan, they are existing uses that are not anticipated to change (San Mateo County Replacement Jail and Police Station). Acreages for OS districts are excluded as they do not generate growth.

See Appendix F for service population calculations.

SOURCE: MIG, 2014; Redwood City General Plan, 2010

The reduction in residential growth with the Specific Plan is because the existing Mixed Use Waterfront (MU-WF) General Plan designation permits a higher residential density and applies to more land area than what would occur in the Plan Area. Further, the Specific Plan will designate much of the existing MU-WF area as Open Space (OS) in which housing development could not occur. On the other hand, the increase in projected employment growth in the Plan Area compared to the General Plan is due to the different types of non-residential land uses in the Specific Plan that garner more employees per floor area than the General Plan.

**Table 4.11-5** shows that the amount of residential growth anticipated from development under the Specific Plan would account for about 6 percent of the total growth projected for Redwood City between 2015 and 2040, and more than one-third (37 percent) of the Citywide employment growth. As discussed above, the Specific Plan proposes new non-residential land uses and areas (primarily within IH-2) that would result in substantially more employment population than estimated under the General Plan. Employment growth under the Specific Plan would be approximately 54 percent from 2015 to 2040 compared to the nearly 21 percent employment growth under the General Plan. At the same time, a nearly 45 percent reduction in residential growth from the Specific Plan compared to the approximately 26 percent residential growth estimated under the General Plan counters the substantial employment population increase. Further, the result is that, by 2040, the total population in the Specific Plan Area would account for approximately 3.4 percent of the Citywide population.

**TABLE 4.11-5  
 SPECIFIC PLAN AND CITYWIDE GROWTH 2015-2040**

	Residents (Percent Growth 2015- 2040)	Employees (Percent Growth 2015-2040)	Total
Specific Plan Growth and Percent Change (from Table 4.11-4)	1,211 (-44.8%)	4,880 (+53.7%)	<b>6,091</b>
Redwood City Growth and Percent Change (from Table 4.11-1)	20,500 (+25.5%)	13,320 (+20.8%)	
<b>Specific Plan Growth as Percent of Citywide Growth</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>37%</b>	
Total Citywide Population 2040 <sup>a</sup>			<b>178,280</b>
<b>Specific Plan Population as Percent of Citywide 2040 <sup>a</sup></b>			<b>3.4%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Residents and employees.

**Table 4.11-6** shows how the growth associated with the Specific Plan affects the growth previously projected in the General Plan and by ABAG *Projections*, and that the overall effects (increases) are relatively minimal.

**TABLE 4.11-6  
 SPECIFIC PLAN GROWTH FACTORED INTO SPECIFIC PLAN 2030 AND CITYWIDE GROWTH 2040**

	Change without Specific Plan	Change with Specific Plan
General Plan Growth 2008-2030 (based on Table 4.11-3)	31.1%	31.5%
Redwood City Growth 2015-2040 (based on Table 4.11-3)	23.4%	23.8%

<sup>a</sup> Specific Plan Growth per Table 4.11-4.

### **Infrastructure and Growth**

Development under the Specific Plan would not induce population growth beyond the growth contemplated in the General Plan such that new or existing infrastructure would need to be extended into areas not previously anticipated by the City. Much of the Plan Area is considered an infill site in an existing urban waterfront area largely served by existing infrastructure. Previously planned infrastructure improvements are currently under way in the vicinity of the Plan Area, and additional improvements to existing infrastructure will directly support development under the Specific Plan. These improvements would be required for any substantive redevelopment of the Plan Area, including that envisioned by the General Plan. As described in the Chapter 3, *Project Description*, and in Section 4.13, *Utilities and Service Systems*, the Specific Plan includes new water pipelines, two new recycled water, upsizing stormwater pipelines and pumping capacity, new sanitary sewer mains, and new joint (gas and electrical) trench installations.

As discussed above, the change in population growth in the Plan Area would not be substantially greater than what would occur with the maximum buildout of the Plan Area under the General Plan, therefore the proposed improvements would not substantially induce growth not previously anticipated.

### **Secondary and Temporary Effects of Growth**

Development under the Special Plan could spur new nearby development outside of the Specific Plan Area, as new residents, employees, and visitors in the Plan Area create demand for services and goods in close proximity. Such effects would potentially occur over time with development under the Specific Plan, which could develop over several years or decades. Regardless, the potential secondary growth would have been already anticipated, particularly in terms of ensuring adequate infrastructure, since transition of the Plan Area has been anticipated for several years since adoption of the General Plan. Moreover, the area surrounding the Plan Area is largely developed and served by existing services and utilities, so any secondary effects from development of the Specific Plan is not anticipated to be substantial. (Also see *Growth-Inducing Impacts*, in Chapter 6 of this EIR.) The impact would be less than significant.

Construction of development under the Specific Plan would result in temporary construction employment. Therefore the employment growth associated with that work would be limited to the intermittent periods of construction of individual projects or infrastructure improvements. Overall, no long-term population growth is expected from secondary effects.

### **Summary**

Overall, development under the Specific Plan would not result in “substantial” population growth compared to that previously considered by the General Plan or compared to that projected Citywide, either as a result of new housing and commercial uses proposed or as a result of infrastructure improvements. The impact would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** None Required

### ***Substantial Displacement of Housing and People***

**Impact POP-2.SP: Development under the Specific Plan would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or people, necessitating construction of replacement housing elsewhere. (Criteria b and c) (No Impact)**

Development under the Specific Plan would not involve the displacement of existing housing units or people. As discussed in the *Environmental Setting* above, people in the Plan Area currently reside in the Docktown Marina liveaboards (as well as being temporarily housed in institutional and group living quarters that will not be removed by implementation of the Specific Plan.) For conservative analysis purposes, up to 140 persons reside in up to 100 private liveaboards in the Plan Area.

Adoption of the Specific Plan would not change the legal status of the existing Docktown liveaboards nor cause displacement of these uses. As discussed in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, the California State Lands Commission (CSLC) has determined that private residential use violates the terms of the City's granting statutes and is inconsistent with Public Trust Doctrine because private residential uses are neither necessary nor convenient for the promotion and accommodation of commerce, navigation, or any of the other permitted uses on Public Trust lands.<sup>7</sup> (CSLC, 2014) The Specific Plan proposes opportunities for a new floating home community of up to 100 watercraft in the proposed WD-2 district on a portion of the Ferrari Property.

Implementation of the Specific Plan would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people. There is no impact.

**Mitigation:** None Required.

---

## **4.11.6 Project-Level Impacts of the Harbor View Project**

### ***Induce Population Growth***

**Impact POP-1.HV: Approval and development of the Harbor View project would not induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure) (Criterion a). (Less than Significant)**

---

<sup>7</sup> As specified in California State Lands Commission (CSLC) correspondence to the City of Redwood City, dated August 7, 2014, permitted uses of lands which come under the jurisdiction of the Public Trust include commerce, navigation, fisheries, ecological habitat protection, water-oriented recreation and preservation of land in its natural condition.

Development of the Harbor View project would result in up to 5,600 new employees on the project site.<sup>8</sup> Some level of population growth on the Harbor View project site was anticipated in the General Plan growth assumptions and is supported and encouraged by numerous policies in the General Plan.

The Harbor View project would require associated amendments to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance to accommodate the proposed intensity (floor area ratio [FAR]) and building height of the project, which exceed the maximums set forth in the General Plan, as well as associated amendments to the Inner Harbor Specific Plan (presumably approved prior to consideration of the project) and additional approvals, as described in 3.6.3 in Chapter 3, *Project Description*. The current General Plan land use designation for the project site is “Industrial – Light” (LI) which supports low-intensity industrial uses, including research and development (R&D). Development could occur up to a 0.75 FAR and three stories.

As shown in Table 4.11-4, the maximum General Plan capacity allotted 741,400 square feet of light industrial/R&D uses in the 26 acres of LI-designated lands in the Inner Harbor area.<sup>9</sup> On the approximately 22 acres of LI-designated land comparable to the Harbor View project site, 630,190 square feet of light industrial/R&D use would generate an estimated 1,575 employees under the General Plan. As such, the Harbor View project will result in substantially more population growth, with approximately 4,025 more workers on site, than envisioned by the land uses and FAR permitted under the General Plan. As described in the Project Description and Section 4.9, *Land Use and Planning*, the Harbor View project may also be eligible for Incentive Zoning Standards specific to the IH-2 district (as well as the IH-1 and WD-2 districts) that would further increase the height (Building Height Bonus) and FAR (Bonus FAR). The project could gain development bonuses if the project sponsor delivers prescribed “community benefits” intended to offset particular impacts associated with the proposed development (see Section 3.3.10 in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, of this EIR).<sup>10</sup>

The Harbor View project comprises a prominent area (in location and size) of the Redwood Creek/Harbor Center area where overall growth is envisioned. As discussed in Impact POP-1.SP, the General Plan envisioned transformation of the overall Redwood Creek/Harbor View area from primarily industrial to high-density, pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use development with a focus on waterfront activity. To fully evaluate the net change in growth envisioned by the General Plan, the growth *increase* from the Harbor View project site should be considered with the other areas of Redwood Creek/Harbor View where growth *decrease* would occur (such as where the Specific Plan proposes changes that will result in less population growth (see Table 4.11-4).

<sup>8</sup> The impact analysis in this EIR conservatively applies 1,400,000 square feet of commercial office use for the Harbor View project. The 5,600 employees is based on the 1.4 million square feet. The project sponsor’s application to the City proposes 1,250,468 square feet.

<sup>9</sup> The IL General Plan designation is mapped on two non-contiguous areas that generally aligned with the Specific Plan’s proposed IH-2 district and part of its OS-L district, east of Lane A/Maple Street extension. See Figure 3-5 in Chapter 3, *Project Description*.

<sup>10</sup> Community benefits can contribute to reducing potential effects involving natural habitats, increased motor vehicle trips, the need for open space and recreation areas; as well as affordable housing.

Growth resulting from the Harbor View project would comprise approximately 7.2 percent of the total Citywide population (77,480 employees) in 2040.

**TABLE 4.11-7  
HARBOR VIEW PROJECT AND CITYWIDE EMPLOYMENT - 2040**

	<b>Employees</b>
Total Harbor View Project Employment <sup>a</sup>	5,600
Total Citywide Employment (Table 4.11-1)	77,480
<b>Specific Plan Population as Percent of Citywide 2040</b>	<b>7.2%</b>

<sup>a</sup> 250 employees per square foot of commercial office use. The impact analysis in this EIR conservatively applies 1,400,000 square feet of commercial office use for the Harbor View project.

Overall, substantially more growth (4,025 employees or approximately 3.5 times) would occur from the Harbor View project compared to growth anticipated under the General Plan *on that same project site*. However, that growth increase would not require or involve the extension of existing infrastructure into areas not previously anticipated by the City. The project site is currently serviced by all main utility infrastructures. As described in in the Chapter 3, *Project Description*, and in Section 4.13, *Utilities and Service Systems*, the Harbor View project includes relocation of existing water lines, sanitary sewer pipe (and payment of mitigation fees toward overall system improvements), extension of pipes to the existing recycled water system, and relocation of existing stormwater drains. These types of improvements would be required for any substantive redevelopment of the Plan Area, including that envisioned by the Specific Plan. The impact would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** None Required

---

### ***Substantial Displacement of Housing and People***

**Impact POP-2.HV: Development of the Harbor View project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or people, necessitating construction of replacement housing elsewhere. (Criteria b and c) (No Impact)**

Development of the Harbor View project would not involve the displacement of existing housing units or people as none exist on the project site, which is largely coincident with the proposed IH-2 district and an additional commercial parcel beyond the Plan Area. There is no impact.

**Mitigation:** None Required.

---

## 4.11.7 Cumulative Impacts

**Impact POP-1.CU: Construction activity and development under the Specific Plan and/or the Harbor View project, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future projects within and in the vicinity of the Plan Area and project site, would not result in a significant effect to population, housing, and employment. (Less than Significant)**

### Geographic Context

The geographic context for the cumulative consideration of population, housing, and employment effects includes the Specific Plan Area and its surroundings, the City of Redwood City, and San Mateo County (encompassing Redwood City's sphere of influence) to consider the citywide and regional context. Certain regional information is considered in order to provide a broader regional context.

Criterion "a" (whether the proposal will induce substantial population growth, directly or indirectly, such that additional infrastructure is required) is inherently a cumulative consideration, as it considers the proposed Specific Plan and Harbor View project growth relative to past, present and future data trends and plans. Much of the cumulative context is imbedded in the development forecasts conducted for this EIR (see Appendix H), and in the cumulative projects list (past, approved, pending, under construction) included in Table 4.0-1 in Section 4.0 of this chapter. The analysis above is based on these projections, which take into account cumulative growth through 2040 for the geographic context described above.

As discussed in Impacts POP-1.SP and POP-1.HV, some of the population growth (residents and employees) that would result from development under the Specific Plan and the Harbor View project was anticipated in Redwood City's General Plan maximum growth assumptions. The General Plan clearly envisioned increased growth through a mix of land uses in the Redwood Creek/Harbor Center area. Tables 4.11-3 and 4.11-4 compare various growth factors under the General Plan and Specific Plan scenarios. Much of the Harbor View project is already considered in the Specific Plan, and as discussed in Impact POP-1.HV, its larger development (compared to the Specific Plan and the General Plan for the Harbor View project site only) would result in substantially more growth than the General Plan envisioned for the Harbor View project site.

In all cases, the growth envisioned by the City – including cumulative growth in the General Plan and beyond the Redwood Creek/Harbor Center area – drives and/or is imbedded in local planning forecasts, regional development forecasts and travel demand models, as well as the City's ongoing capital improvement program for the renewal of aging infrastructure. While infrastructure improvements and extensions are required to support the proposed development under the Specific Plan and/or the Harbor View project, they would be required for any substantive redevelopment of the Plan Area, including the maximum growth envisioned for the Redwood Creek / Harbor Center area in the General Plan. The Plan Area is currently serviced by all main utility infrastructure, and the improvements would be specific to the development sites within the Plan Area and/or Harbor View project site.

When considered in combination with other cumulative development, growth from development under the Specific Plan and development of the Harbor View project would not induce substantial additional population growth, nor displace substantial numbers of people or housing units.

**Mitigation:** None Required.

---

## References – Population, Housing and Employment

- Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), 2013. *Bay Area Plan Projections 2013*. December 2013.
- Association of Bay Area Governments/Metropolitan Transportation Commission (ABAG/MTC), 2012a. *Plan Bay Area: Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy*. May 16, 2012.
- Association of Bay Area Governments/Metropolitan Transportation Commission (ABAG/MTC), 2012b. Selected census data for San Francisco Bay, available online at [www.bayareacensus.ca.gov/bayarea.htm](http://www.bayareacensus.ca.gov/bayarea.htm), accessed September 19, 2012.
- Bay Area Economics (BAE), 2014. *Redwood City Inner Harbor Specific Plan Market Overview and Demand Analysis*. February 2014.
- California Department of Finance (CDOF), 2012. *E-8 Historic Population and Housing Estimates 2000-2010, by Area. (2000 data)* November 2012.
- California Department of Finance (CDOF), 2015a. *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, January 2011-2015, with 2010 Benchmark. (2010 data)* May 2015.
- California Department of Finance (CDOF), 2015b. *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, January 2011-2015, with 2010 Benchmark. (2015 data)* May 2015.
- California Employment Development Department (EDD), 2014a. *Monthly Labor Force Data for Counties*. March 21, 2014.
- California Employment Development Department (EDD), 2014b. *California Labor Market Review*. February 2014.
- City of Redwood City, 2010. *Redwood City General Plan 2010*, October 11 2010. Accessed March 05, 2015. [http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/generalplan/FinalGP\\_Docs.html](http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/generalplan/FinalGP_Docs.html).
- City of Redwood City, 2010a. *New General Plan Draft EIR*. Accessed August 16, 2015. [http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/eir/generalplaneir\\_draft.html](http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/eir/generalplaneir_draft.html), May 2010.
- California State Lands Commission (CSLC), 2014. Correspondence from CSLC (Sheri Pemberton, Chief, External Affairs) to the City of Redwood City (Bill Ekern, Assistant City Manager, dated August 7, 2014.

U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), 2008. *Building Area by Employee, By Business Type*.  
Accessed August 27, 2015. [https://www.google.com/  
?gws\\_rd=ssl#q=employees+per+square+foot+industrial](https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=employees+per+square+foot+industrial)

This page intentionally left blank