
4.10 Population and Housing

4.10.1 Introduction

This section evaluates the potential population and housing impacts from the proposed Computational Research and Theory (CRT) project. Information presented in the discussion and subsequent analysis was drawn from site visits, census data, estimates prepared by the State of California Department of Finance, and the City of Berkeley, city and regional projections prepared by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG).

No scoping comments related to population and housing were received in response to the Notice of Preparation circulated for this EIR.

4.10.2 Environmental Setting

Regional Population

There were approximately 7.1 million people living in the nine-county Bay Area region in 2005. The region's population grew at a compound rate of 1.2 percent per year from 1990 to 2000. The Bay Area also experienced substantial increases in employment opportunities in the 1990s. The number of jobs increased at a compound rate of 1.6 percent per year, growing to a total of 3.4 million jobs in the nine-county region in 2005 (ABAG 2007)

Projections prepared by ABAG in June 2007 reflecting a "smart growth forecast" for the Bay Area show regional population growth of almost 2.2 million and an increase of about 800,000 households for the 2000 through 2035 period. For the region as a whole, the projection is for growth of over 30 percent over levels in 2000. In a departure from previous trend-based forecasts, this population and housing scenario reflects a "smart growth" vision: emphasizing infill development to revitalize central cities, support and enhance public transit, and preserve open space and agricultural land. The smart growth scenario assumes that local policies and regulations that currently limit this type of development are changed and that there is significant public investment on a regional and local level in infrastructure and in housing to achieve higher levels of housing production, and particularly high density housing near transit. The "smart growth" scenario illustrates a development pattern that, over the long term, assumes central Bay Area locations such as San Francisco, Berkeley, Oakland, Emeryville, Alameda, Fremont, Union City, Albany, El Cerrito, and Richmond absorb more housing production and population growth than would otherwise be the case. Regionally and locally, the scenario has implicit benefits in an improved balance of jobs and housing, less in-commuting, and more efficient development patterns that preserve open space and agricultural land (ABAG 2007).

Population and household growth for Berkeley and Albany represent about 1 percent of the total population and household growth forecast for the Bay Area region. Population growth is expected to continue in the city of Berkeley, building on the trends of the 1990s. The “smart growth forecast” shows an increase of over 13,000 people in the city of Berkeley between 2000 and 2025 (a 13 percent increase over 2000 levels) and an increase of almost 5,000 households in the city (an 11 percent increase over that same period). Using the adjusted 2000 population count for the city of Berkeley as a base, the total population living in the city could reach 119,700 by 2025. In Albany, population is forecast to increase by 14 percent to a total of 18,700 people in 2025. The forecast shows an additional 850 households in Albany between 2000 and 2025, an increase of 12 percent over the period (ABAG 2007).

LBNL Population

In 2003, there were 3,800 people employed by the Berkeley Lab. Most of these employees (56 percent) were full-time employees in scientific and technical positions. Administrative support positions accounted for 16 percent of the Berkeley Lab employment. Faculty (7 percent of the total), and postdoctoral researchers (6 percent of the total), as well as undergraduate and graduate students (combined representing 15 percent of the total) were also counted among the Berkeley Lab’s employees (LBNL 2007).

In 2003, over the course of the year, a total of about 2,500 people used Berkeley Lab facilities as guests. Guests include industry and government researchers working at the Berkeley Lab for short-term assignments, scientists visiting from other academic institutions, or people from other institutions such as UC Davis who use Lab facilities regularly over a period of weeks or months. On an average day, 40 percent of total annual guests use Berkeley Lab facilities. In 2003, this represented about 1,000 people on any given day. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) estimates an adjusted total daily population of 4,375 people for 2003, counting both employees and guests; of the total, 3,650 adjusted daily population (ADP) are on the Berkeley Lab’s main site on any given day (LBNL 2007).¹

LBNL employees and their dependents represented 2.0 percent of the Berkeley and Albany population in 2003. In all other residential locations, Lab employees and their dependents accounted for less than one percent of the total population. Lab employees and their dependents represented 0.3 percent of the total population of Emeryville, Oakland and Piedmont; 0.6 percent of the total population of El Cerrito, Richmond, and San Pablo; and 0.7 percent of the total population of Lafayette, Moraga, and Orinda. For the Bay Area region as a whole, Lab employees and the other members of their households represented 0.1 percent of total regional population in 2003 (LBNL 2007).

¹ The LBNL estimate of adjusted daily population (ADP) is defined to include FTE employment plus 40 percent of total annual guests.

4.10.3 Regulatory Considerations

Local Plans and Policies

The proposed project would be located at LBNL, which is operated by the University of California and conducts work within the University's mission on land that is owned or controlled by The Regents of the University of California. As a state entity, the University is exempted by the state constitution from compliance with local land use regulations, including general plans and zoning. However, the University seeks to cooperate with local jurisdictions to reduce any physical consequences of potential land use conflicts to the extent feasible. LBNL is located in both the city of Berkeley and the city of Oakland. The following sections summarize policies from the City of Berkeley and City of Oakland General Plans that relate to population and housing.

City of Berkeley General Plan

The City of Berkeley Draft General Plan was published in October 2000 and on December 18, 2001, the Berkeley City Council certified the General Plan EIR and approved the Housing, Land Use, and Transportation Elements. In spring 2002, the City Council approved the six remaining elements of the General Plan.

The Housing Element expresses a key local policy objective related to population and housing impacts (LBNL 2007).

The University of California and other institutions should take responsibility for housing demands they generate which create additional pressure on the private housing market in Berkeley. By doing so, they would help avoid causing or increasing housing problems for other Berkeley residents. The City will work with the University and other State institutions to create new housing and jointly address housing issues of mutual concern (LBNL 2007).

Specific policies and actions addressing this relationship with other institutions are as follows:

Policy H-33 University of California: Urge the University of California to maximize the supply of appropriately located, affordable housing for its students, and also to expand housing opportunities for faculty and staff.

Policy H-34 Group Quarters: Support and encourage construction of group housing near the University for student housing.

Policy H-35 University Housing and Taxes: Support development of new housing for University-related households and other institutions that will not take additional land off tax rolls. If that is

not possible, seek compensation for loss of revenue; seek agreement from the State of California, the University, and other institutions to compensate the City of Berkeley for services provided; and encourage that developments provide community facilities for both students and other residents.

Policy H-35 University Housing and Displacement: Support University-related housing that avoids displacement of existing residents of a loss of existing rental housing resources available to other city residents.

A related Land Use Element policy also addresses University housing:

Policy LU-37 University Housing: Encourage the University to maximize the supply of housing for students, faculty, and staff to minimize the impacts of the University on the citywide supply of housing.

City of Oakland General Plan

The Oakland General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element were approved in March 1998. Policy language is focused on economic development (Industry and Commerce policies), Transportation and Transit-Oriented Development, Downtown, the Waterfront, and the Neighborhoods, as well as Housing; there is limited discussion of institutional uses and employment:

Policy N2.3 Supporting Institutional Facilities: The City should support many uses occurring in institutional facilities where they are compatible with surrounding activities and where the facility site adequately supports the proposed uses.

Policy N2.5 Balancing City and Local Benefits of Institutions: When reviewing land use permit applications for the establishment or expansion of institutional uses, the decision-making body should take into account the institution's overall benefit to the entire Oakland community, as well as its effects upon the immediately surrounding area.

Policy N2.8 Long Range Development Planning: Require, where legally allowed, and encourage in all other situations, those institutions designated with the "Institutional" land use classification should be required to present Long Range Operation and Development Plans to the City Planning Commission. While these plans could be binding or non-binding, they should present realistic information regarding the continued operation and/or expansion of the facilities. The City suggests that substantial public input be built into the process of developing the plans. The plans could be required as a part of the development applications, or on a periodic basis.

4.10.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significance Criteria

The impact of the proposed project on population and housing would be considered significant if it would exceed the following Standards of Significance, in accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and the UC CEQA Handbook:

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

Issues Not Discussed Further

The CRT facility Initial Study found that implementation of the proposed project would not displace any existing housing or people, which would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The proposed project does not include housing or long-term residential uses and no housing or individuals would be displaced as a result of its implementation.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

CRT Impact POP-1: The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project does not include residential uses, and would not involve an extension of other infrastructure such as water and sanitary sewer that could indirectly induce substantial population growth. The proposed project would generate incidental, short-term construction employment that would create an undetermined number of new jobs. Operation of the proposed CRT facility would accommodate approximately 300 employees, of which approximately 225 would be LBNL staff and 75 would be UC Berkeley staff and students. Of the approximately 225 LBNL staff, about 135 would be existing staff relocated from the adjacent Building 50 Complex, 70 would be relocated from the off-site Oakland Scientific Facility, and approximately 20 staff would be new or relocated LBNL staff. The CRT facility would therefore add up to approximately 165 additional staff and students to the Lab site. The increase in new employees and students due to the proposed project would add new persons to the Bay Area. Assuming conservatively that each new person associated with the CRT project does not reside

within the nine County Bay Area at the time he/she begins working in the proposed facility and each such person decides to relocate into the Bay Area to be close to the CRT facility, 165 new persons would not add substantially to the total population of the Bay Area and would represent 0.0023 percent of the Bay Area's 2005 population as estimated by ABAG.

The population added by the project to any individual city within the Bay Area would be even a smaller percentage. Based on current residential trends for LBNL employees, approximately 35 percent (58) of the new staff would be Berkeley residents and approximately 14 percent (23) would be Oakland residents (LBNL 2007). These new persons would not add substantially to the total population of Berkeley or Oakland, and the population added by the project to any other individual city within the Bay Area would likely be even a smaller percentage of the new persons. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce a substantial population growth, either directly or indirectly in the project region and its impact with respect to this criterion is considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: No project-level mitigation measure required.

4.10.5 References

Association of Bay Area Governments. 2007. ABAG Projections 2007. June
<http://www.abag.ca.gov/planning/currentfcst/regional.html>

City of Berkeley. 2001. General Plan Housing Element Appendix.

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. 2007. 2006 Long Range Development Plan Final Environmental Impact Report. SCH No. 2000102046. July.