

3.13 Population and Housing

3.13.1 Introduction

This section describes the regulatory and environmental setting for population and housing in the vicinity of the Proposed Project [including all track variants, technology variants, and the Greenville and Mountain House initial operating segments (IOS)] and the alternatives analyzed at an equal level of detail (Southfront Road Station Alternative, Stone Cut Alignment Alternative, West Tracy Operation and Maintenance Facility [OMF] Alternative, Mountain House Station Alternative, and Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternatives 1 and 2). It also describes the impacts on population and housing and mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts, where feasible and appropriate for the Proposed Project and the alternatives analyzed at an equal level of detail. There would be no differences in the physical impacts on recreational resources due to the diesel multiple unit (DMU), hybrid battery multiple unit (HBMU), battery-electric multiple unit (BEMU), or diesel locomotive haul (DLH) technology variants, so the discussion in this section does not discuss those variants. Potential impacts associated with implementation of the Proposed Project and the alternatives analyzed at an equal level of detail assume the larger environmental footprint at proposed and alternative stations associated with a potential IOS (i.e., Greenville IOS, Mountain House IOS, Southfront Road Station Alternative IOS, and Mountain House Station Alternative IOS) and/or the expanded parking in 2040. As such, the analysis of the Proposed Project and the alternatives analyzed at an equal level of detail below considers the potential impacts associated with a potential IOS and/or the expanded parking in 2040.

Cumulative impacts on population and housing, in combination with planned, approved, and reasonably foreseeable projects, are discussed in Chapter 4, *Other CEQA-Required Analysis*.

3.13.2 Regulatory Setting

This section summarizes federal, state, regional, and local regulations related to population and housing and applicable to the Proposed Project and the alternatives analyzed at an equal level of detail.

3.13.2.1 Federal

There are no federal regulations related to population and housing that are relevant to this analysis.

3.13.2.2 State

California Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Guidelines

The California Government Code requires that relocation assistance be provided to any person, business, or farm operation displaced because of the acquisition of real property by a public entity for public use (25 California Code of Regulations [Cal. Code Regs.] § 6000 et seq.). In addition, comparable replacement properties must be available for each displaced person within a reasonable period of time prior to displacement. These guidelines establish uniform and equitable procedures for land acquisition as well as uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by state and state-assisted programs.

3.13.2.3 Regional and Local

Appendix I, *Regional Plans and Local General Plans*, provides a list of applicable goals, policies, and objectives from regional and local plans of the jurisdictions in which the Project is proposed. Section 15125(d) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines requires an environmental impact report to discuss “any inconsistencies between the Proposed project and applicable general plans, specific plans, and regional plans.” These plans were considered during preparation of this analysis and reviewed to assess whether the Proposed Project and the alternatives analyzed at an equal level of detail would be consistent with the plans of relevant jurisdictions. As further detailed in Section 3.13.4.3, *Impacts and Mitigation Measures*, under the discussion of Impact POP-1, the Proposed Project and the alternatives analyzed at an equal level of detail would be generally consistent with the applicable goals, policies, and objectives related to population and housing identified in Appendix I; however, because they would be located in areas where local policies discourage or strictly limit growth, the Greenville Station and Mountain House Station, Mountain House Station Alternative, and West Tracy OMF Alternative could be inconsistent with local growth-related policies.

Authority Policy

The Board-adopted transit-oriented development (TOD)¹ policy supports the regional goals of both San Joaquin County and the Bay Area by encouraging the development of station area plans tailored to the goals and objectives of each community. At a minimum, these plans will define the land use plan for the area, zoning, design standards, parking policies and station access plans. The TOD policy, along with the Board-adopted sustainability policy, presents strategies to create vibrant and livable station area communities within the proposed station environs.

Metropolitan Transportation Commission Resolution 3434

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Resolution No. 3434 requires certain specified transit projects to meet a minimum corridor threshold for existing and planned housing development within 0.5 mile of transit stations, as well as station area planning and corridor working groups to achieve the thresholds in order for the specified projects to qualify for funding through MTC. The Valley Link Project is not included in the specified transit projects included in Resolution 3434 and thus this policy does not apply.

3.13.3 Environmental Setting

This section describes the environmental setting related to population and housing by the geographic segment. For the purposes of this analysis, the study area includes the municipalities where Valley Link stations are proposed as well as the potential catchment areas for Valley Link ridership: eastern Alameda County and both western and central San Joaquin County.

Although track improvements are necessary for increased operational service, these improvements would not themselves provide direct access to or an interface with Valley Link. Because the physical distribution of ridership throughout the region is the primary driving factor for changes in

¹ Transit-oriented development (TOD) is characterized by dense mixed-use development in proximity to a transit station such that residents and employees of and visitors to the surrounding development can walk to the transit station.

population and housing, the study area and analysis focus on the jurisdiction in which the stations would be located because the stations represent the interfaces between the communities and Valley Link.

Information for the population and housing setting was obtained from the following sources: California Department of Finance (2018), Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) (2018), and Eberhardt School of Business (2016).

3.13.3.1 Overview of Regional Growth

Table 3.13-1 provides the estimated existing population (2017) and projected population growth by 2040 for Alameda and San Joaquin Counties. Although projections show that growth in Alameda County will be relatively similar to growth in the state as a whole between 2017 and 2040 (slightly higher in Alameda County), San Joaquin County is projected to grow at a rate nearly two times that of the state during the same period. The Valley Link service would serve primarily the growing population in San Joaquin County by providing a transit alternative to interregional freeway travel between the fast-growing population centers of San Joaquin County and the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) system, as well as the employment centers of the greater Bay Area.

3.13.3.2 Demographic Profiles

Demographic profiles are provided for the following areas:

- Tri-Valley: Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore, and the whole of Alameda County
- Tracy to Lathrop: Tracy, Lathrop, Manteca, unincorporated San Joaquin County, and the whole of San Joaquin County

The new stations identified for the Altamont segment (Mountain House Station and Mountain House Station Alternative) would not be within any incorporated municipality but, rather, in unincorporated San Joaquin County. These stations would be used by residents in Tracy as well as residents of the Mountain House community and other residents in western San Joaquin County.

In general, the profiles provided in Table 3.13-1 indicate that population and housing growth rates are anticipated to be substantially higher in San Joaquin County than in Alameda County.

Table 3.13-1. Existing and Projected Populations of Counties in the Project Corridor

County	Estimate		Projections				Change in Population (2017-2040) (%)	Average Annual Growth Rate (2017-2040) (%)
	2017	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040		
Alameda County	1,650,818	1,703,660	1,790,456	1,873,622	1,953,455	2,027,328	22.8	1.0
San Joaquin County	749,092	782,662	838,755	894,330	947,019	995,469	32.9	1.4
California	39,613,019	40,639,392	42,326,397	43,939,250	45,440,735	46,804,202	18.2	0.8

Source: California Department of Finance 2018.

3.13.3.3 Tri-Valley

Table 3.13-2 shows existing population and projected growth in Dublin, Pleasanton, and Livermore, and in the whole of Alameda County. Dublin and Livermore are projected to grow at a higher annual rate than Alameda County as a whole. Pleasanton is projected to grow at a lower annual rate than Alameda County as a whole. The populations of Dublin, Pleasanton, and Livermore are projected to have a 2.0, 0.5, and 1.3 percent average annual growth rate from 2017 to 2040, respectively.

Table 3.13-3 shows existing housing units and projected growth in Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore, and Alameda County as a whole. Housing units in Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore, and Alameda County are projected to have a 1.5, 0.2, 1.0, and 1.0 percent average annual growth rate from 2017 to 2040, respectively.

Table 3.13-4 shows the job projections for the counties in the Bay Area. Valley Link would serve primarily commuters accessing the Bay Area. As shown in Table 3.13-4, several hundreds of thousands of jobs are projected by 2040 for Alameda, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties. As of 2015, more than 65,000 San Joaquin County residents commuted to jobs in the nine-county Bay Area (Eberhardt School of Business 2015). Also, as noted in Chapter 1, *Introduction*, this number is projected to continue to increase as the Bay Area produces more jobs; as cities in the Northern San Joaquin Valley such as Manteca, Livermore, Tracy, and Stockton continue to grow; and as traffic over the already-congested Altamont Pass increases by a projected 75 percent in 2040.

3.13.3.4 Altamont

The station proposed for the Altamont segment (Mountain House Station) would be a likely point of entry to the Valley Link system for people living in western San Joaquin County (including the Mountain House community), as well as west Tracy.

Several major housing development projects in San Joaquin County have been approved and partially constructed as of 2019. The projected Valley Link ridership base is expected to come from a combination of people living in housing units already constructed as of 2019 plus people who are anticipated to live in an approved/permitted housing unit that has yet to be constructed as of 2019. Table 3.13-5 summarizes the remaining number of housing units that have not yet been constructed but which have been permitted. In total, approximately 35,075 housing units for the Mountain House, Tracy Hills, Ellis Specific Plan, River Islands, and Central Lathrop Specific Plan developments, and development in Manteca remain to be constructed. The anticipated addition of 35,075 housing units would lead to a corresponding addition of approximately 108,740 people to the area.² Relative to the existing populations, these previously approved developments would represent substantial additional growth.

3.13.3.5 Tracy to Lathrop

Table 3.13-6 shows existing population and projected growth in Tracy, Lathrop, Manteca, and San Joaquin County as a whole. Between 2017 and 2040, the populations of Tracy, Lathrop, and Manteca are projected to increase by 46.0, 180.1, and 38.0 percent respectively. As shown in Table 3.13-6, Lathrop's population is projected to nearly triple its 2017 population by 2040. The data in Table 3.13-6 demonstrates the very robust population growth anticipated to occur in San Joaquin County,

² The population was estimated assuming the average household size in San Joaquin County in 2017 (i.e., 3.1).

in part associated with several major development projects (seven projects in all) which are together projected to account for a substantial percentage of this population growth (more than 108,000 new people in all).

Table 3.13-7 shows existing housing units and projected growth. Housing units in Tracy and Lathrop are projected to have a 1.8 and 5.7 percent annual growth rate, respectively, from 2017 to 2040. Table 3.13-8 shows the job projections for San Joaquin County. The growth rate of jobs in San Joaquin County is expected to be well below the corresponding rate of population growth.

Table 3.13-2. Tri-Valley—Population Projections

Jurisdiction	Estimate		Projections				Change in Population (%)	Average Annual Growth Rate (%)
	2017	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040		
Dublin	57,022	51,070	54,780	71,870	78,140	83,595	46.6	2.0
Pleasanton	79,341	75,030	76,235	78,370	83,115	87,875	10.8	0.5
Livermore	88,232	84,935	89,960	99,115	106,190	113,730	28.9	1.3
Alameda County	1,629,615	1,711,460	1,776,495	1,868,635	1,960,630	2,092,370	28.4	1.2

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2017; ABAG 2018.

Table 3.13-3. Tri-Valley—Housing Unit Growth Projections

Jurisdiction	Housing Units Estimate	Vacancy Rate	Projections					Change in Housing Units (%)	Average Annual Growth Rate (%)
	2017	2017	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040		
Dublin	19,587	2.9%	16,150	17,345	23,250	25,065	26,475	35.2	1.5
Pleasanton	29,064	3.9%	27,040	27,365	27,990	29,320	30,575	5.2	0.2
Livermore	32,458	3.4%	30,405	32,180	35,570	37,570	39,675	22.2	1.0
Alameda County	596,989	4.7%	614,965	637,395	668,285	696,370	734,210	23.0	1.0

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2017; ABAG 2018.

Table 3.13-4. Job Projections in the Bay Area

Jurisdiction	Projections					Change in Jobs (%)	Average Annual Growth Rate (%)
	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040		
Alameda County	858,685	877,220	901,080	933,725	952,940	11.0	0.5
San Francisco County	785,530	823,505	840,270	862,315	872,510	11.1	0.6
San Mateo County	399,275	415,305	423,005	436,205	472,045	18.2	0.9
Santa Clara County	1,120,420	1,159,110	1,198,370	1,231,000	1,289,870	15.1	0.8

Source: ABAG 2018.

This page was intentionally left blank.

Table 3.13-5. Previously Approved Major Development Projects in San Joaquin County and Anticipated Population Growth

Development	Total Number Permitted Housing Units	Total Number of Housing Units Constructed (as of 2018/2019)^a	Permitted But Not Yet Constructed Housing Units (as of 2018/2019)^a	Anticipated Population Associated with Permitted But Not Yet Constructed Units	Nearest Proposed Project or Alternative Station	Projected 2040 Daily Boardings at Nearest Proposed Project or Alternative Station	Approximate Driving Distance to Nearest Proposed Project or Alternative Station (miles)
Mountain House ^b	16,000	6,000	10,000	31,000	Mountain House Station or Mountain House Station Alternative	765	4.0
Tracy Hills	5,500	20	5,480	16,990	Mountain House Station or Mountain House Station Alternative	765	6.0
Ellis Specific Plan ^c	2,250	250	2,000	6,200	Downtown Tracy Station, Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1, and Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2	1,995	4.2
River Islands	11,000	1,500	9,500	29,450	River Islands Station	1,615	0.1 – 3.5
Central Lathrop Specific Plan	6,800	0	6,800	21,080	North Lathrop Station	4,230	2.3
Villa Ticino West	760	0	760	2,360	North Lathrop Station	4,230	2.7
South of Woodward Avenue North Project	706	171	535	1,660	North Lathrop Station	4,230	9.2
Total	43,016	7,941	35,075	108,740	N/A	N/A	N/A

Sources: Mountain House: San Joaquin County 1994a, 1994b, 2005a, 2005b; Tracy Hills: City of Tracy 2016, Tracy Hills 2019; Ellis Specific Plan: City of Tracy 2013; River Islands: City of Lathrop 2019 and Wyatt 2019; Central Lathrop Specific Plan: City of Lathrop 2004 and Campbell 2019; Villa Ticino West: City of Manteca 2015; South of Woodward Avenue North Project: City of Manteca 2013.

^a The remaining number of housing units that have been permitted but not yet constructed for the Mountain House, Ellis Specific Plan, Villa Ticino West, and South of Woodward Avenue North Project was determined based on Google Earth aerial imagery from June 2018. The remaining number of housing units that have been permitted but not yet constructed for the Tracy Hills Development was based on an update on the Tracy Hills website from 2019 (Tracy Hills 2019). The remaining number of housing units that have been permitted but not yet constructed for the River Islands Station development was based on a news article from June 2019 (Wyatt 2019). The remaining number of housing units that have been permitted but not yet constructed for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan development was based on a news article from January 2019 (Campbell 2019).

^b The Mountain House development was divided into three separate locations and three different Specific Plans were prepared. Specific Plan I includes neighborhoods E, F, and G and would include a total of 4,107 dwelling units. Based on Google Earth aerial imagery dated June 2018, these neighborhoods appear to be completely constructed. Specific Plan II includes neighborhoods C, D, H, I, J, K, and L, and a town center, and would include a total of 9,029 dwelling units. Based on Google Earth aerial imagery dated June 2018, neighborhood H appears to be completely constructed, neighborhoods C and D appear to be under construction, and neighborhoods I, J, K, and L, and the town center appear to not yet be constructed. Based on the number of dwelling units expected at the neighborhoods and town center (see Table 3-2 of Specific Plan II), it is estimated that approximately 2,000 dwelling units have been constructed as a part of Specific Plan II. Specific Plan III includes neighborhoods A/B and would include a total of 2,240 dwelling units. Based on Google Earth aerial imagery dated June 2018, these neighborhoods appear to not yet be constructed. Based on this information it is expected that approximately 6,000 housing units have been constructed (4,000 in neighborhoods E, F, G and 2,000 in neighborhoods C, D, and H).

^c The Ellis Specific Plan has identified three phases of development, and based on Google Earth aerial imagery dated June 2018, it appears that Phase 1 of the project is underway with some homes being constructed. The aerial imagery was used to estimate the number of houses that have been constructed. A total of approximately 250 houses were identified as being completely constructed or under construction.

This page intentionally left blank.

Table 3.13-6. Altamont and Tracy to Lathrop—Population Projections

Jurisdiction	Estimate		Projections				Change in Population (%)	Average Annual Growth Rate (%)
	2017	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040		
Tracy	87,613	95,040	102,236	109,492	118,130	127,933	46.0	2.0
Lathrop	21,050	28,896	35,475	42,109	50,007	58,969	180.1	7.8
Manteca	75,314	77,018	82,912	88,855	95,930	103,958	38.0	1.7
San Joaquin County	724,153	775,819	829,426	883,484	947,835	1,020,862	41.0	1.8

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2017; Eberhardt School of Business 2016.

Table 3.13-7. Altamont and Tracy to Lathrop—Housing Unit Growth Projections

Jurisdiction	Housing Units Estimate	Vacancy Rate	Projections					Change in Housing Units (%)	Average Annual Growth Rate (%)
	2017	2017	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040		
Tracy	26,359	3.4%	27,767	29,920	32,357	34,656	37,539	40.3	1.8
Lathrop	5,718	4.1%	7,440	9,310	11,162	13,135	15,441	130.7	5.7
Manteca	24,644	4.7%	26,570	28,404	30,343	32,487	34,975	41.9	1.8
San Joaquin County	239,253	6.5%	259,051	277,070	294,751	314,470	337,448	41.0	1.8

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2017; Eberhardt School of Business 2016.

Table 3.13-8. Altamont and Tracy to Lathrop—Job Projections

Jurisdiction	Projections					Change in Jobs (%)	Average Annual Growth Rate (%)
	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040		
San Joaquin County	256,019	270,185	285,095	299,918	314,544	22.9	1.0

Source: Eberhardt School of Business 2016.

3.13.4 Impact Analysis

This section describes the environmental impacts of the Proposed Project (including all track and technology variants) on population and housing, as well as the environmental impacts related to population and housing due to the alternatives analyzed at an equal level of detail. It describes the methods used to evaluate the impacts and the thresholds used to determine whether an impact would be significant. Measures to mitigate significant impacts are provided, where appropriate.

3.13.4.1 Methods for Analysis

As described in Section 3.13.4.2, *Thresholds of Significance*, the Proposed Project and the alternatives analyzed at an equal level of detail could result in a significant population and housing impact, if it were to directly or indirectly induce growth or displace existing residential development. Although a key objective is to provide a transit alternative to interregional automobile travel and serve existing populations in the Central Valley, the Proposed Project and the alternatives analyzed at an equal level of detail have the potential to indirectly induce unplanned growth by extending passenger rail service and infrastructure to places that are currently lacking such services.

The induced growth analysis is appropriately focused in the areas to which Valley Link would provide service (e.g., the area in which train riders live now and in the future). Therefore, for the induced population growth analysis of areas proximal to Proposed Project and alternative stations, city and county general plans, specific plans, and other relevant planning documents were reviewed to determine the level of planned growth in these areas and whether such plans already support or encourage TOD or intensified development near Proposed Project and alternative station sites or, alternatively, whether such plans call for preservation of existing uses and intensities. Where a Proposed Project or alternative station would be located on or near land in a jurisdiction that is supportive of TOD or intensified development near transit (even if such transit does not currently exist), that station would not be considered growth inducing. Plans for growth adopted by local cities and counties as well as the status of buildout of previously permitted large development projects in San Joaquin County were also reviewed to examine whether there remain substantial amounts of planned growth in order to determine whether service may result in substantial amounts of unplanned growth by inducing housing demand beyond current plans for housing. Mere inducement of planned population growth is not considered a significant impact. A significant impact is only identified if substantial amounts of unplanned population growth would result.

For the displacement analysis, aerial photography was reviewed to determine whether the Proposed Project and the alternatives analyzed at an equal level of detail would encroach onto residential properties. Estimates of displaced residents were based on information from Appendix C, *Preliminary Right of Way Requirements*, which summarizes the parcels from which rights-of-way (ROW) or easements would be required. These parcels were evaluated to determine if any housing would be temporarily or permanently displaced and if replacement housing would be required.

3.13.4.2 Thresholds of Significance

State CEQA Guidelines Appendix G (14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15000 et seq.) has identified significance criteria to be considered in determining whether a project could have significant impacts related to population and housing.

An impact would be considered significant if construction or operation of the Proposed Project and the alternatives analyzed at an equal level of detail would:

- Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure).
- Displace a substantial number of existing people or housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

3.13.4.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact POP-1: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project could substantially induce, either directly or indirectly, unplanned population growth in an area.

Level of Impact Prior to Mitigation	<p>Potentially significant (mitigation required) <u>Proposed Project</u> Greenville Station Mountain House Station</p> <p>Less than significant <u>Proposed Project</u> Valley Link Service overall (except for the two stations noted above) Dublin/Pleasanton Station Isabel Station Interim OMF Tracy OMF Downtown Tracy Station River Islands Station North Lathrop Station</p> <p><u>Alternatives Analyzed at an Equal Level of Detail</u> Southfront Road Station Alternative Stone Cut Alignment Alternative West Tracy OMF Alternative Mountain House Station Alternative Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1 Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2</p> <p>No impact <u>Proposed Project</u> Tri-Valley Alignment Altamont Alignment Owens-Illinois Industrial Lead Variant 1, Single Track Owens-Illinois Industrial Lead Variant 2, Double Track Tracy to Lathrop Alignment Variant 1, Single Track Tracy to Lathrop Alignment Variant 2, Double Track</p>
Mitigation Measures Level of Impact After Mitigation	<p>None Feasible Significant and unavoidable <u>Proposed Project</u> Greenville Station Mountain House Station</p>

Impact Characterization

Construction

Construction of the Proposed Project would have the potential to temporarily induce local population growth through the employment of workers during the construction period. The employment opportunities created through construction of the Proposed Project would be temporary. Construction is not anticipated to induce growth, beyond creating temporary employment opportunities during construction. Moreover, some of the employment opportunities are anticipated to be filled by local workers who already reside in the general vicinity and therefore would not contribute to population growth. Thus, construction of the Proposed Project would have a less-than-significant impact on unplanned population growth.

For the same reasons listed above, construction of the four alternative stations (Southfront Road Station Alternative, Mountain House Station Alternative, Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1, Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2), the Stone Cut Alignment Alternative, and the West Tracy OMF Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact on unplanned population growth.

Operation and Maintenance for the Proposed Project

The Proposed Project may induce substantial amounts of unplanned population growth in three ways: (1) if the Proposed Project would result in a substantial amount of permanent employment that results in a substantial amount of unplanned growth; (2) if the Proposed Project improvements (i.e., construction of stations, train operations) indirectly facilitate land use changes in the immediate vicinity of station areas that would result in substantial amounts of unplanned growth; or (3) if Valley Link service would substantially increase housing demand beyond planned levels.

Population growth is not anticipated to occur in locations where only track improvements or maintenance facilities are proposed because such facilities would not provide any direct interface for people to board or disembark trains, and thereby potentially induce population growth in a particular area. These improvements would, therefore, not stimulate TOD or result in any growth inducement.

Operation of the Proposed Project would have the potential to induce local population growth, particularly but not exclusively in the immediate areas around proposed stations because stations would introduce or expand access to transit services, which may induce demand for growth in the immediate proximity to transit stations due to the convenience for both residents and employees; this analysis focuses on the immediate area surrounding proposed stations. In addition, operation of the Proposed Project could result in regional growth within areas in which people could conveniently access the transit stations; this analysis includes eastern Alameda County and western and central San Joaquin County.

Extensions of transit services with new stations, such as those proposed under the Proposed Project, have been known to result in population growth in the areas where the new and/or increased service is provided. TOD can be an attractive means by which to accommodate such growth. Research on induced growth around transit stations indicates that although access to transit can attract development around stations, other conditions must be in place for such growth to be induced.

A comprehensive survey of research on the impact of rail transit on property values found that proximity to rail typically increases the attractiveness of properties adjacent to transit for development (Diaz 1999). This increased attractiveness was found to be associated primarily with the relative increase in accessibility to transit services. However, a number of factors were found to influence the relative attractiveness of adjacent property for TOD, including the existing land uses in the vicinity of the rail stations and the willingness of local jurisdictions to accommodate such development. A study on employment growth around new transit stations in California between 1992 and 2006 found no correlation between opening new transit stations and employment growth in the immediate vicinity. Rather, the largest observed increase in employment growth around new transit stations was in areas that already supported high-density development (Kolko 2011).

Studies suggest that transit stations are more likely to increase the attractiveness of developing the surrounding area if land use policies and the character of the area are conducive to such development. If local land use policies support increased development and population growth, new stations are more likely to induce TOD. Although construction of a new transit station or expansion of an existing transit station, such as at the Tracy Transit Center, which currently serves only buses but would become part of the Valley Link Downtown Tracy Station with the Proposed Project, could make surrounding land more attractive to developers, an expansion of transit service by itself would not induce growth. Local land use policies, market conditions, political attitudes, and regulatory constraints would all inform the feasibility of developing TOD around Proposed Project stations.

New stations would provide accessibility and transit services and could be an attractive benefit with respect to intensified development. However, the additional growth may not necessarily be new net growth in a community. The growth may be a redistribution of planned growth that takes advantage of transit availability in the community. The extent to which a new station indirectly induces unplanned growth is examined in light of the local land use and development policies of the jurisdiction where the station would be located. Policies in a station jurisdiction that call for land use intensification and uses that are supportive of transit suggest that induced growth would be beneficial and not unplanned. By contrast, policies in a station jurisdiction that call for preservation or protection of natural land, open space, or farmland suggest that induced growth would not be beneficial and unplanned.

Section 3.11, *Land Use and Planning*, identifies how the Proposed Project would support the ability of cities to pursue TOD where stations are proposed (see Section 3.11.2.3, *Regional and Local*). For station area planning, the Tri-Valley–San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority (Authority) is committed to working with communities to identify and incorporate high-priority local goals and objectives for individual stations.

Project Employment

The Proposed Project would generate employment for operation and maintenance activities. While daily work activities could occur at any point along the proposed alignment, all jobs are assumed to be “housed” at the OMF. Accordingly, growth associated with Proposed Project employment would be expected in the vicinity of the OMF.

Operation of the Interim OMF and the Tracy OMF would generate approximately 170 jobs in 2040. This represents approximately 0.2 percent of the 2017 population of Tracy. In addition, as summarized in Table 3.13-5, there are approximately 35,075 permitted housing units that have yet

to be constructed in western San Joaquin County. Any population demand generated by the Interim OMF or Tracy OMF would be expected to be accommodated by the substantial number of planned/permitted housing units. Therefore, this employment would not generate substantial demand for new housing or induce substantial new unplanned population growth. The impact would be less than significant.

Project Alignments

Proposed track improvements (Tri-Valley Alignment; Altamont Alignment; Owens-Illinois Industrial Lead Variant 1, Single Track; Owens-Illinois Industrial Lead Variant 2, Double Track; Tracy to Lathrop Alignment Variant 1, Single Track; and Tracy to Lathrop Alignment Variant 2, Double Track) do not have the potential to induce growth or accelerate population growth rates in the surrounding areas because they would not offer an interface with expanded transit service. Therefore, no impact would occur related to unplanned population growth due to track improvements.

Alameda County

Growth Inducement Potential in Eastern Alameda County due to Valley Link Service

A substantial portion of eastern Alameda County has been designated as “Measure D” lands, which are preserved for agricultural use and open space. The Mountain House Station is approximately 1.3 miles from lands in Alameda County that are designated as “Measure D” lands. The ridership estimates for Valley Link indicate that a substantial number of individuals would board the Valley Link system from stations in San Joaquin County. In fact, 70 percent of the originating trips in 2040 (assuming the full build-out from Dublin/Pleasanton Station to North Lathrop Station) would be from the Mountain House, Downtown Tracy, River Islands, or North Lathrop Station (see Table 6 in Appendix F, *Valley Link Ridership Technical Memorandum*). Nonetheless, the potential of inducing population growth in eastern Alameda County from Valley Link service, due to the proximity of the Mountain House Station, would be very unlikely because Measure D requires the preservation of agricultural use and open space and limits development in these areas. These regulations, along with the relative distance from proposed nearby Valley Link stations located in San Joaquin County, and the substantial increment of permitted but not yet constructed housing units in San Joaquin County are likely to collectively preclude the potential for Valley Link to result in substantial unplanned growth in eastern Alameda County. Thus, the impact from growth inducement in eastern Alameda County would be less than significant.

Dublin/Pleasanton Station

Dublin/Pleasanton Station would be Valley Link’s western terminus, consistent with the Proposed Project objective of linking the San Joaquin County area to the transportation network of the San Francisco Bay Area.

The Proposed Project would include a platform that would allow transfers between Valley Link and BART. The Proposed Project would not construct or expand parking at the Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station because riders would be anticipated to reach this station by taking Valley Link trains from points east and then connecting to the larger BART system and San Francisco Bay Area. Some proportion of the people who currently drive from points east in San Joaquin County and park at the Dublin/Pleasanton BART station to access BART would be expected to shift their mode of travel from automobile to Valley Link. Tables 5 and 6 in Appendix

F, *Valley Link Ridership Technical Memorandum*, provide the following ridership estimates for the Dublin/Pleasanton Station:

- Approximately 11,400 riders would off-board and approximately 410 riders would on-board at Dublin/Pleasanton Station in 2025 (assuming the full build-out from Dublin/Pleasanton Station to North Lathrop Station).
- Approximately 29,630 riders would off-board and approximately 690 riders would on-board at Dublin/Pleasanton Station in 2040 (assuming the full build-out from Dublin/Pleasanton Station to North Lathrop Station).

Regional job distribution patterns do not indicate that a substantial number of people would use Dublin/Pleasanton Station to board eastbound Valley Link trains. Ridership estimates indicate that few people would on-board at Dublin/Pleasanton Station in the morning. Rather, most users of Valley Link would off-board at Dublin/Pleasanton Station in the morning. In the evening, these commuters would board the train at Dublin/Pleasanton Station and head east. Therefore, no ancillary improvements, such as parking, would be necessary.

Substantial growth inducement is not expected to occur as a result of improvements at Dublin/Pleasanton Station because this station would not constitute a major new facility that could stimulate changes to land use character in the vicinity. Rather, the proposed station would be constructed in an area where mixed-use and high-density residential development is planned. North of Dublin/Pleasanton Station, in the City of Dublin, planned land uses include commercial, business-park, and medium- and high-density residential land uses (City of Dublin 1985). In addition, approximately 1,500 feet north of Dublin/Pleasanton Station is the Dublin Crossing Specific Plan area, which calls for a combination of commercial, mixed-use, and medium- and high-density residential uses (City of Dublin 2013). The Dublin Crossing Specific Plan area has the residential development potential for up to 1,995 dwelling units and 75,000 to 200,000 gross square feet of commercial uses. South of the Dublin/Pleasanton Station, within the City of Pleasanton, the planned land uses include business-park, commercial, and medium- and high-density residential land use designations (City of Pleasanton 2005).

Policies within the general plans of Dublin and Pleasanton support housing that is close to transit centers. Pleasanton's Land Use Element identifies policies and programs to "integrate land use and transportation planning" (Policy 2) and "reduce the need for vehicular traffic by locating employment, residential, and service activities close together" (Program 2.1) (City of Pleasanton 2005). The Dublin Crossing Specific Plan "establishes a vision for a vibrant, compact, walkable, bicycle-friendly, transit-oriented community" (City of Dublin 2013).

The ridership estimates indicate that in 2040, 93 percent of the destined trips for Valley Link would be to the Dublin/Pleasanton Station (see Table 6 in Appendix F, *Valley Link Ridership Technical Memorandum*). While some commuters would use Valley Link to access the BART system, some commuters would also use the Valley Link system to access jobs in Dublin and Pleasanton. Thus, there is the potential that implementation of the Dublin/Pleasanton Station would make Dublin and Pleasanton a more attractive place for jobs, which could induce job growth. However, both Dublin and Pleasanton have existing job opportunities in existing business parks, including the Hacienda Business Park in the City of Pleasanton, which is adjacent to the Dublin/Pleasanton Station. Furthermore, the number of jobs is expected to grow in the Cities of Dublin and Pleasanton by 45.9 and 15.7 percent, respectively, between 2020 and 2040 (ABAG 2018). Thus, any job growth that would be induced by implementation of the Dublin/Pleasanton Station would be in line with planned job growth in the area. In summary, the Dublin/Pleasanton Station would not be expected

to stimulate substantial population growth because the station would be expected to be used by commuters from points east who would either transfer to BART and continue traveling west into the central Bay Area or off-board at Dublin/Pleasanton to a nearby employment destination. Furthermore, growth is planned around the existing BART station (e.g., in the Dublin Crossing Specific Plan), and there are currently existing employment opportunities in the nearby business parks, many of which are likely held by San Joaquin County residents, given known employment patterns. Valley Link would provide a transit alternative to serve such employees who currently drive from San Joaquin County. Based on the foregoing, the Dublin/Pleasanton Station would not be expected to stimulate substantial unplanned population or job growth. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

Isabel Station

Isabel Station would be located in the City of Livermore. The station site is designated for light industrial land uses in the City of Livermore General Plan (City of Livermore 2004). The area adjacent to Isabel Station is characterized by light industrial uses, open space, and limited agriculture. Southeast of Isabel Station, land uses are characterized as medium- and high-density residential. The area north of Isabel Station is characterized by business and commercial land use designations.

Some of the land around Isabel Station is currently vacant; therefore, there are locations where development could occur. In fact, the City of Livermore planned for residential development around the proposed station site as a part of the Isabel Neighborhood Specific Plan. The Isabel Neighborhood Specific Plan presumed the extension of BART to Livermore, which BART rejected. However, the City of Livermore has updated the Isabel Neighborhood Specific Plan to consider the Valley Link station and service (City of Livermore 2020).

Isabel Station could induce population growth; however, any population growth that would occur as a result of the station would be consistent with the policies of the City of Livermore General Plan (City of Livermore 2004), which encourages high-density, mixed-use development near transit services. One goal of the Land Use Element of the City of Livermore General Plan is to “provide areas for high-density mixed-use development near transit” (Goal LU-3). Isabel Station would enhance regional transit connectivity, thereby strengthening overall accessibility to transit services in the Tri-Valley. Although Isabel Station could intensify density in the area surrounding the station, this intensification would be a redistribution of planned growth that would take advantage of transit availability in the community. Furthermore, the City of Livermore has updated the Isabel Neighborhood Specific Plan to accommodate the Valley Link station (City of Livermore 2020). Because Isabel Station would be considered beneficial and complementary to land use and growth plans, impacts would be less than significant because operation of the Isabel Station would not result in unplanned growth.

Greenville Station

Portions of Greenville Station would be in an area designated for large-parcel agriculture and outside the Urban Growth Boundary for Alameda County (Alameda County 1994). The station could result in growth inducement in the vicinity due to increased accessibility to transit services. Urban development that could be attracted to the vicinity of the potential station would be incompatible with the existing policies governing land use and growth in unincorporated eastern Alameda County. The ability for this growth to occur, however, would depend on Alameda County and Livermore changing their land use and growth policies to enable such development. Construction of

the station outside the Urban Growth Boundary would create pressures to develop and would be a possible indirect effect.

Portions of Greenville Station would be outside the Urban Growth Boundary for Alameda County, an area where urban development is not currently planned. The City of Livermore may consider extending the Urban Growth Boundary and re-zoning land uses around Greenville Station to permit housing density. Extending the Urban Growth Boundary would require approval from both Alameda County and the City of Livermore. As such, although development proposals arising around Greenville Station on unincorporated land within Livermore's sphere of influence would be contingent on review and approval by Alameda County and the City of Livermore, such development would currently be inconsistent with adopted plans and policies for Livermore. This inconsistency could result in a potentially significant impact because it could result in development in areas outside the urban limit lines, areas that contain habitat for threatened and endangered species, as well as unplanned growth that was not anticipated in City of Livermore or Alameda County planning documents.

In addition, the Greenville Station is located on and near areas designated for industrial land use designations. The implementation of the Greenville Station could result in the conversion of these industrial land uses into residential land uses. Any population growth that would occur as a result of the Greenville Station would be consistent with the policies of the City of Livermore General Plan (City of Livermore 2004), which encourages high-density, mixed-use development near transit services. One goal of the Land Use Element of the City of Livermore General Plan is to "provide areas for high-density mixed-use development near transit" (Goal LU-3). The Greenville Station would enhance regional transit connectivity, thereby strengthening overall accessibility to transit services in the Tri-Valley. Although the Greenville Station could intensify density in the area surrounding the station, this intensification would in part be expected to be a redistribution of planned growth that would take advantage of transit availability in the community. Because the Greenville Station would be considered beneficial and complementary to land use and growth plans, these impacts would be less than significant because the project would not result in unplanned growth.

Interim OMF

The Interim OMF would be outside the Urban Growth Boundary for Alameda County, in an area where urban development is not currently planned. The Interim OMF would be located on lands that have been designated as Measure D lands, which are preserved for agricultural use and open space. An OMF, unlike a station, does not have the potential to induce substantial population growth. The OMF would not provide any opportunity for commuters to access the Valley Link system; rather, the OMF would be used as the employment base for all workers operating and maintaining the proposed system. Therefore, it is not expected that population growth would occur in the area surrounding the Interim OMF.

San Joaquin County

Growth Inducement Potential in Central and Western San Joaquin County due to Valley Link Service

People in central and western San Joaquin County would use Valley Link to access the BART system. These commuters would access the Valley Link Service by using the Mountain House Station, Downtown Tracy Station, River Islands Station, and North Lathrop Station. Based on preliminary modeling, it is expected that approximately 22,350 people per day would access the Valley Link

system at these stations in 2040 (assuming the full build-out from Dublin/Pleasanton Station to North Lathrop Station) (see Table 6 in Appendix F, *Valley Link Ridership Technical Memorandum*). As summarized in Section 3.13.3.4, *Altamont*, there are approximately 35,075 housing units that have been permitted but have yet to be constructed, which is expected to add approximately 108,740 people to the population.

The addition of Valley Link infrastructure and passenger service could theoretically induce growth in western San Joaquin County. However, this growth would be considered unsubstantial relative to the substantial existing population base plus the large backlog of approved but not yet constructed housing units from several major development projects. Such approved/planned growth is expected to substantially increase populations in San Joaquin County by 2040. At the same time, job projections for both San Joaquin County and nearby Bay Area counties suggest a continuation of the growth in people who live in San Joaquin County but commute to jobs in a Bay Area county, which is growth that is projected to occur without the construction or operation of Valley Link.

Mountain House Station

Mountain House Station would be in unincorporated San Joaquin County, approximately 3.5 miles from the edge of the City of Tracy and approximately 4.0 miles driving distance from the edge of the Mountain House community.

Mountain House Station would be located on undeveloped land that has been designated for general agriculture use. Mountain House Station would be surrounded primarily by undeveloped lands, with light industrial uses to the east. Mountain House Station would serve primarily the planned population of the Mountain House community. As of 2019, approximately 10,000 houses that were part of the original project approval have not yet been constructed. The addition of 10,000 houses could bring an additional 31,000 people to the Mountain House community. Mountain House Station would also serve the planned population of the Tracy Hills development, which is approximately 6.0 miles driving distance from the Mountain House Station. As of late 2018, construction of the Tracy Hills development has been under way, and approximately 5,480 housing units remain to be constructed. The addition of 5,480 housing units could bring a total of 16,990 people to the area (Tracy Hills 2019).³ Mountain House Station is intended to serve this planned growth and provide the residents of Mountain House and Tracy Hills with an alternative means of interregional access. Nonetheless, because of the distance from the nearest community, and because the site is surrounded by undeveloped land, development of Mountain House Station could still result in increased urbanization around the station. As such, any growth that would be induced around the immediate area of Mountain House Station would be considered unplanned and, therefore, would be a potentially significant impact.

Tracy OMF

Population growth is not expected to occur in the area surrounding the Tracy OMF because the OMF would not provide any opportunity for commuters to access the Valley Link system. The OMF would be used as the employment base for all workers operating and maintaining the proposed system. Operation of the Tracy OMF would require the same number of workers as the proposed Interim OMF (170 jobs in 2040). As such, the potential impact on unplanned growth due to employment at the Tracy OMF would be the same as the impact from employment at the Interim OMF. The

³ The population was estimated assuming the average household size in San Joaquin County in 2017 (3.1).

employment at the Tracy OMF would not generate substantial demand for new housing or induce substantial new unplanned population growth. Thus, the impact on unplanned population growth from operation of the Tracy OMF would be less than significant.

Downtown Tracy Station

Downtown Tracy Station would be located at the existing Tracy Transit Center, which currently operates as a hub for local, commuter, and long-distance bus services. The station is in a primarily urbanized setting but with several vacant areas to the east and west. Downtown Tracy Station would be within the plan area for the Downtown Specific Plan. The Downtown Specific Plan identifies the existing transit center site as the site for a future “multi-modal transit station” that would accommodate local and regional buses, taxis, shuttles, parking, and future rail operations (City of Tracy 2009). The Downtown Specific Plan also identifies a vacant area (known as the “bowtie” property) located east and west of the existing Tracy Transit Center as a site for “urban neighborhood” development. An Urban Neighborhood District is identified in the Downtown Specific Plan as an area with an opportunity to develop new residences on underutilized or vacant sites, with the intent of having residents live within a few minutes of cafes, restaurants, entertainment, services, and transit. Therefore, the vacant areas immediately adjacent to the proposed Downtown Tracy Station are already planned for development. Furthermore, the Tracy General Plan identifies “urban reserve” areas, which are relatively large, undeveloped, contiguous geographic areas where residential, commercial, and office development is expected (City of Tracy 2011). Ten urban reserve areas are identified in the Tracy General Plan, with a vision for developing 6,260 dwelling units and approximately 38 million square feet of commercial, office, and industrial uses. Downtown Tracy Station would serve the new residents that are planned for in the general plan. Because Downtown Tracy Station would be adjacent to an area where residential development is already planned, and because the City of Tracy is planning for population growth within the urban reserve areas, the proposed station is likely to serve this planned growth and would not induce new or unplanned growth. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

River Islands Station

River Islands Station would be on the southern edge of the approved River Islands at Lathrop Project. The River Islands at Lathrop Project entails establishment of 11,000 homes, a town center, and an employment center, which would generate thousands of jobs for local residents. Construction is under way to complete this project, and approximately 9,500 housing units remain to be constructed (City of Lathrop 2019). The addition of 9,500 housing units could generate a population of approximately 29,450.⁴ This project identifies a future station along the Tracy Subdivision in the vicinity. River Islands Station would be in an area that is planned for employment center uses. Because River Islands Station would be located adjacent to an area where population growth is already planned by the City of Lathrop, the proposed station is not likely to induce new or unplanned growth around the station site. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

North Lathrop Station

North Lathrop Station would be in an urbanized area of Lathrop adjacent to existing residential development to the west and industrial complexes to the north, east, and south. Commuters from both the Cities of Lathrop and Manteca would access Valley Link at the North Lathrop Station. Population

⁴ The population was estimated assuming the average household size in San Joaquin County in 2017 (i.e., 3.1).

growth is already planned in the Cities of Lathrop and Manteca. North Lathrop Station would serve this planned population growth. Approximately 6,800 dwelling units and 5 million square feet of office and retail uses are planned as part of the Central Lathrop Specific Plan, which applies to an area west of Interstate (I-) 5 and approximately 1 mile from the proposed North Lathrop Station (City of Lathrop 2004). This development could generate a population of approximately 21,080.⁵ There are two development projects that have yet to be constructed in Manteca that would be located approximately 2.7 and 9.2 miles from the North Lathrop Station (see Table 3.13-5). These two development projects have 1,295 housing units that have yet to be constructed and could generate a population of approximately 4,020.⁶ Because North Lathrop Station would be adjacent to existing developed employment centers and housing, and in an area where population growth is already planned by the Cities of Lathrop and Manteca, the proposed station is not likely to induce new or unplanned growth around the station site. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

Greenville IOS and Mountain House IOS

Implementation of the Greenville IOS would require construction of the Tri-Valley Alignment, Dublin/Pleasanton Station, Isabel Station, Greenville Station, Interim OMF, and a portion of the Altamont Alignment. Implementation of the Mountain House IOS would require construction of the Tri-Valley Alignment; Dublin/Pleasanton Station; Isabel Station; Greenville Station; Altamont Alignment; Owens-Illinois Industrial Lead Variant 1, Single Track or Owens-Illinois Industrial Lead Variant 2, Double Track; Mountain House Station; and Tracy OMF.

The potential impacts from these proposed alignments, stations, and OMFs are identified above. As such, implementation of the Greenville IOS would result in a potentially significant impact on induced, unplanned population growth (due to the Greenville Station). Likewise, implementation of the Mountain House IOS would result in a potentially significant impact on induced, unplanned population growth (due to the Greenville Station and Mountain House Station).

Operation and Maintenance for the Alternatives Analyzed at an Equal Level of Detail

Alameda County

Growth Inducement Potential in Eastern Alameda County due to Valley Link Service

As described above for the Proposed Project, the potential of inducing population growth in eastern Alameda County from Valley Link service would be very unlikely because Measure D requires the preservation of agricultural use and open space and limits development in these areas, because of the substantial increment of permitted but not yet constructed housing units in San Joaquin County. Implementation of the Southfront Road Station Alternative instead of the Greenville Station would result in the same less-than-significant impact on growth inducement in eastern Alameda County.

Southfront Road Station Alternative

The Southfront Road Station Alternative would be in the City of Livermore. The City of Livermore General Plan identifies that the location of the Southfront Road Station Alternative is designated for commercial land uses (City of Livermore 2004). The area south of Southfront Road Station Alternative is characterized by commercial and industrial land use designations, and the area north

⁵ The population was estimated assuming the average household size in San Joaquin County in 2017 (i.e., 3.1).

⁶ The population was estimated assuming the average household size in San Joaquin County in 2017 (i.e., 3.1).

of Southfront Road Station Alternative, across I-580 is characterized by residential land use designations.

The existing residences north of Southfront Road Station Alternative, as well as any future residences near this location, would use this station. The areas south of Southfront Road Station Alternative is built up with industrial and commercial uses. Nonetheless, like Isabel Station, Southfront Road Station Alternative could result in population growth. This population growth would likewise be consistent with the policies in the City of Livermore General Plan. This station, if constructed, would further enhance regional transit connectivity by increasing access to BART for the Tri-Valley riders. Because Southfront Road Station Alternative is considered beneficial and complementary to land use and future growth plans, impacts would be less than significant.

Stone Cut Alignment Alternative

As described above for the Proposed Project, track improvements, including the Stone Cut Alignment Alternative, do not have the potential to induce growth or accelerate population growth rates in the surrounding areas because they would not offer an interface with expanded transit service. Therefore, no impact would occur related to unplanned population growth due to the Stone Cut Alignment Alternative.

San Joaquin County

Growth Inducement Potential in Central and Western San Joaquin County due to Valley Link Service

As described above for the Proposed Project, the population growth in central and western San Joaquin County due to Valley Link service would be considered unsubstantial relative to the substantial existing population base plus the large backlog of approved but not yet constructed housing units from several major development projects. Implementation of station alternatives (Mountain House Station Alternative, Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1, and Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2) and the West Tracy OMF Alternative would result in the same less-than-significant impact on growth inducement in central and western San Joaquin County.

West Tracy OMF Alternative

Population growth is not expected to occur in the area surrounding the West Tracy OMF Alternative because the OMF would not provide any opportunity for commuters to access the Valley Link system. The OMF would be used as the employment base for all workers operating and maintaining the proposed system. Operation of the West Tracy OMF Alternative would require the same number of workers as the proposed Interim OMF (170 jobs in 2040). As such, the potential impact on unplanned growth due to employment at the West Tracy OMF Alternative would be the same as the impact from employment at the Interim OMF. The employment at the West Tracy OMF Alternative would not generate substantial demand for new housing or induce substantial new unplanned population growth. Thus, the impact on unplanned population growth from operation of the West Tracy OMF Alternative would be less than significant.

Mountain House Station Alternative

The Mountain House Station Alternative would be in unincorporated San Joaquin County, approximately 2.5 miles from the edge of the City of Tracy and approximately 4.0 miles driving distance from the edge of the Mountain House community.

The Mountain House Station Alternative would be located on undeveloped land that is surrounded by development, with light industrial uses to the north, water infrastructure to the south and west, and rural residential and agricultural uses to the east. Like the Mountain House Station, the Mountain House Station Alternative would serve planned population growth in the Mountain House community, the Tracy Hills development, the Ellis development, and other areas of west Tracy and western San Joaquin County. The Tracy Hills development would be located approximately 6.0 miles driving distance from the Mountain House Station Alternative, and the Ellis development would be located approximately 6.0 miles driving distance from the Mountain House Station Alternative.

Unlike the Mountain House Station, the Mountain House Station Alternative would be located in an area where developmental potential of the immediate surrounding land is limited by the surrounding environment, particularly water infrastructure. An approximately 60-acre site northeast of the proposed Mountain House Station Alternative location could theoretically be developed. This 60-acre site, which is currently being used for agricultural purposes, is approximately 0.05 mile north of the Mountain House Station Alternative, across the tracks. In addition, within 0.5 mile of the Mountain House Station Alternative location, approximately 40 acres of undeveloped lands are located between two canals and could theoretically be developed. Given the existing infrastructure constraints, these areas would not lend themselves easily to conversion to higher-intensity uses. In sum, the Mountain House Station Alternative would not significantly increase development potential in the immediate surrounding area, and its impact would therefore be less than significant.

Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1 and Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2

The impact of the Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1 and Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2 would be the same as the impacts described for the proposed Downtown Tracy Station. Because the Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1 and Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2 would be adjacent to an area where residential development is already planned, and because the City of Tracy is planning for population growth within the urban reserve areas, the Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1 and Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2 are likely to serve this planned growth and would not induce new or unplanned growth. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

Significance of Impacts

The Greenville Station could result in pressures to develop the surrounding area with urban uses that would be incompatible with currently adopted plans and policies in the station vicinity. Development within the unincorporated county would be contingent upon review and approval by the City of Livermore and Alameda County and require changes to both Livermore and the county urban limit lines, thereby requiring a vote by residents of both Livermore and Alameda County. The Authority considered mitigation to coordinate with Alameda County and the City of Livermore to initiate a general plan amendment planning process to address the issues related to population growth in the Greenville area. The Alameda County and the City of Livermore have exclusive responsibility for land use planning in each respective jurisdiction. Because the Authority has no jurisdiction of land use planning within Alameda County and the city of Livermore, mitigation to initiate a general plan amendment process is infeasible. In addition, there is no indication that Alameda County or the City of Livermore intend to amend the general plan.

Because the Authority has no land use authority and cannot mandate changes to local land use plans, there is currently no formal plan to change the planning documents to accommodate a transit station at Greenville Road or additional development around a new transit station. Development in this area would be inconsistent with current planning and would result in unplanned impacts on biological resources, and possibly other resources. Thus, the impact of the Proposed Project from implementation of the Greenville Station is considered significant and unavoidable and mitigation is considered infeasible.

Mountain House Station could result in pressures to develop the immediate surrounding area with urban uses that would be incompatible with currently adopted plans and policies in the vicinity. Development within the unincorporated county would be contingent upon review and approval by the City of Tracy and San Joaquin County and require changes to city and county urban limit lines. The Authority considered mitigation to coordinate with Alameda County, San Joaquin County, and the City of Tracy to initiate a general plan amendment planning process to address the issues related to population growth in the Mountain House Station area. Alameda County, San Joaquin County, and the City of Tracy have exclusive responsibility for land use planning in each respective jurisdiction. Because the Authority has no jurisdiction over land use planning within Alameda County, San Joaquin County, or the city of Tracy, mitigation to initiate a general plan amendment process is infeasible. In addition, there is no indication Alameda County, San Joaquin County, and the City of Tracy intend to amend the general plan.

Furthermore, there are currently no formal plans to change local land use plans to accommodate the Mountain House Station or anticipate additional development around the new transit station. The Authority has no land use authority and cannot mandate changes to local land use plans. Development in the area would be inconsistent with current planning and could result in unplanned impacts on other resource areas. For these reasons, the impact of the Proposed Project from the Mountain House Station would remain significant and unavoidable mitigation is considered infeasible.

Comparison of Alternatives

There would be no difference between the Proposed Project and the alternatives analyzed at an equal level of detail as it relates to construction impacts. Both the Proposed Project and the alternatives analyzed at an equal level of detail would have the same less-than-significant impact on population growth due to construction.

Implementation of the Southfront Road Station Alternative, instead of the proposed Greenville Station, would eliminate a potentially significant unavoidable impact. As summarized above, the Southfront Road Station Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact on unplanned population growth. The proposed Greenville Station would result in a potentially significant and unavoidable impact on unplanned population growth. Therefore, implementation of the Southfront Road Station Alternative would eliminate a potentially significant and unavoidable impact.

Implementation of the Stone Cut Alignment Alternative, instead of the portion of the proposed Altamont Alignment that the Stone Cut Alignment Alternative would replace, would not change the impact associated with unplanned growth. Because the Stone Cut Alignment Alternative and the proposed Altamont Alignment would both only involve track improvements, and because track improvements would not offer an interface with expanded transit service, neither the proposed Altamont Alignment nor the Stone Cut Alignment Alternative would have the potential to attract substantial new growth or accelerate population growth rates in surrounding areas. Therefore,

implementation of the Stone Cut Alignment Alternative would result in the same no impact on unplanned population growth as the proposed Altamont Alignment.

Implementation of the West Tracy OMF Alternative, instead of the Tracy OMF, would not change the impact associated with unplanned growth. Neither the proposed nor the alternative OMF would have the potential to attract substantial new growth or accelerate population growth rates in surrounding areas because they would not increase access to transit services. Therefore, implementation of the West Tracy OMF Alternative would result in the same less-than-significant impact on unplanned population growth as the Tracy OMF.

Implementation of the Mountain House Station Alternative, instead of the proposed Mountain House Station, would eliminate a potentially significant unavoidable impact. As summarized above, the Mountain House Station Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact on unplanned population growth. The proposed Mountain House Station would result in a potentially significant and unavoidable impact on unplanned population growth. Therefore, implementation of the Mountain House Station Alternative would eliminate a potentially significant and unavoidable impact.

Both the Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1 and Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2, and the proposed Downtown Tracy Station would result in the same less-than-significant impacts because they would be adjacent to an area where residential development is already planned, and because the City of Tracy is planning for population growth within the urban reserve areas. Therefore, there would be no difference in impacts between the Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1 and Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2, and the proposed Downtown Tracy Station.

Impact POP-2: Construction and operation of the Proposed Project could displace a substantial number of existing housing units or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Level of Impact	Less than significant
	<u>Proposed Project</u>
	Tri-Valley Alignment
	Downtown Tracy Station
	River Islands Station
	<u>Alternatives Analyzed at an Equal Level of Detail</u>
	Mountain House Station Alternative
	Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1
	Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2
	No Impact
	<u>Proposed Project</u>
	Dublin/Pleasanton Station
	Isabel Station
	Greenville Station
	Altamont Alignment
	Owens-Illinois Industrial Lead Variant 1, Single Track
	Owens-Illinois Industrial Lead Variant 2, Double Track
	Interim OMF

Mountain House Station
Tracy OMF
Tracy to Lathrop Alignment Variant 1, Single Track
Tracy to Lathrop Alignment Variant 2, Double Track
North Lathrop Station

Alternatives Analyzed at an Equal Level of Detail

Southfront Road Station Alternative
Stone Cut Alignment Alternative
West Tracy OMF Alternative

Mitigation Measures **None required**

Impact Characterization and Significance Conclusion

Proposed Project

Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would require land acquisitions outside existing ROWs. Acquisition of parcels with existing residential uses could displace housing units and their occupants. However, the majority of the Proposed Project would be located within or directly adjacent to the existing California Department of Transportation I-580, Alameda County, and Union Pacific Railroad ROW and would not require a substantial number of full parcel acquisitions. Appendix C, *Preliminary Right of Way Requirements*, provides a list of parcels that would be affected by the Proposed Project in terms of requiring full or partial parcel acquisitions or easements.

The following proposed alignments, stations, and OMFs would not require the acquisition of parcels with residential uses, would not displace housing units or people, would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing, and would, therefore, result in no impact: Dublin/Pleasanton Station; Isabel Station; Greenville Station; Altamont Alignment, including the Owens-Illinois Industrial Lead Variant 1, Single Track and Owens-Illinois Industrial Lead Variant 2, Double Track; Interim OMF; Mountain House Station; Tracy OMF; Tracy to Lathrop Alignment Variant 1, Single Track; Tracy to Lathrop Alignment Variant 2, Double Track; and North Lathrop Station.

Table 3.13-9 identified the proposed alignments and stations that would require acquisition of parcels that currently support residential land uses. For parcels that are planned for development, it is conservatively assumed that these parcels would support residential uses, and, as such, these acquisitions are shown in Table 3.13-9. As shown in Table 3.13-9, parcel acquisitions would be required for the Tri-Valley Alignment, Downtown Tracy Station, and the River Islands Station.

Tri-Valley Alignment

As shown in Table 3.13-9, the Tri-Valley Alignment would require the acquisition of four parcels with existing and proposed residential uses. Two of these four parcels are located in areas where there are no homes, but future development is planned. Because the parcel acquisitions would involve small areas, it is not anticipated that they would hinder the development of housing planned within future developments. One of these four parcels currently includes an existing house; however, that would not be displaced by the Tri-Valley Alignment. Finally, one of these four parcels currently includes an existing house in Livermore (single-family residence) that would be acquired as a part of implementation of the Tri-Valley Alignment. As shown in Table 3.13-3, the city of Livermore has a vacancy rate of 3.4 percent. Because one single-family residence would be removed and because there is a vacancy rate of 3.4 percent in the city of Livermore, there is sufficient housing

stock available in the area to accommodate the loss of the one single-family residence. The loss of this one single-family residence would not displace a substantial number of existing housing units or people and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Thus, the impact from the implementation of the Tri-Valley Alignment would be less than significant. In addition, as part of implementation of the Proposed Project, relocation assistance and benefits would be provided to persons displaced as a result of the Proposed Project, consistent with the California Relocation Act.

Downtown Tracy Station

As shown in Table 3.13-9, the Downtown Tracy Station would require the acquisition of one parcel that currently includes an existing house. This house, however, would not be displaced. The Downtown Tracy Station would not require the displacement of any housing or people; therefore, implementation of the Downtown Tracy Station would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing and would result in a less-than-significant impact.

River Islands Station

As shown in Table 3.13-9, the River Islands Station would require the acquisition of three parcels where there are currently no homes but where future development is planned. The River Islands Station may result in a redistribution of planned housing. However, because the parcel acquisitions would involve small areas, it is not anticipated that they would hinder the development of housing planned within future developments. Therefore, the River Islands Station would not displace housing or people, would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing, and would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Greenville IOS and Mountain House IOS

Implementation of the Greenville IOS would require construction of the Tri-Valley Alignment, Dublin/Pleasanton Station, Isabel Station, Greenville Station, Interim OMF, and a portion of the Altamont Alignment. Implementation of the Mountain House IOS would require construction of the Tri-Valley Alignment; Dublin/Pleasanton Station; Isabel Station; Greenville Station; Altamont Alignment; Owens-Illinois Industrial Lead Variant 1, Single Track or Owens-Illinois Industrial Lead Variant 2, Double Track; Mountain House Station; and Tracy OMF.

The potential impacts from these proposed alignments, stations, and OMFs are identified above. As such, implementation of the Greenville IOS and Mountain House IOS would result in a less-than-significant impact due to implementation of the Tri-Valley Alignment.

Alternatives Analyzed at an Equal Level of Detail

The following alternatives would not require the acquisition of parcels with residential uses, would not displace housing units or people, would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing, and would, therefore, result in no impact: Southfront Road Station Alternative, Stone Cut Alignment Alternative, and West Tracy OMF Alternative.

The Mountain House Station Alternative would require the acquisition of one parcel that currently includes an existing house. This house, however, would not be displaced. The Mountain House Station Alternative would not require the displacement of any housing or people; therefore, implementation of the Mountain House Station Alternative would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing and would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Table 3.13-9. Residential Parcel Acquisitions or Easements

Segment	Proposed or Alternative Facility	Existing Residential Uses or Proposed Residential Uses within Parcel	Number of Residential Acquisitions or Easements	Acreage of Residential Acquisition(s) or Easement(s)	Relocation Required?
Tri-Valley	Tri-Valley Alignment	Existing	1	1.05	No
			1	1.52	Yes
		Proposed	2	1.88	No
Altamont	Mountain House Station Alternative	Existing	1	0.92	No
Tracy to Lathrop	Downtown Tracy Station, Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1, and Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2	Existing	1	0.39	No
		River Islands Station	Proposed	3	8.63

The Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1 and Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2 would affect the same parcel as the proposed Downtown Tracy Station. As such, the Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1 and Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Comparison of Alternatives

Implementation of the Southfront Road Station Alternative, Stone Cut Alignment Alternative, and West Tracy OMF Alternative, instead of the proposed Greenville Station and Tracy OMF would not change the impact associated with displacing housing or people. Neither the proposed Greenville Station, Altamont Alignment, and Tracy OMF, nor the Southfront Road Station Alternative, Stone Cut Alignment Alternative, and West Tracy OMF Alternative would have the potential to displace housing or people. Therefore, implementation of the Southfront Road Station Alternative, Stone Cut Alignment Alternative, and West Tracy OMF Alternative would result in the same no impact as the proposed Greenville Station, Altamont Alignment, and Tracy OMF.

The Mountain House Station Alternative would require the acquisition of one parcel with residential uses, would not displace any housing or people, and would result in a less-than-significant impact. The proposed Mountain House Station would not require the acquisition of any parcels with residential uses and would result in no impact. Thus, there is a small difference between the impacts associated with the Mountain House Station Alternative (less than significant) and the proposed Mountain House Station (no impact).

Implementation of the Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1 and Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2, instead of the proposed Downtown Tracy Station would not change the impact associated with displacing housing or people. The station alternatives (Downtown Tracy

Station Parking Alternative 1 and Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2) would require the acquisition of the same parcel as the proposed Downtown Tracy Station. Therefore, implementation of the station alternatives (Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 1 and Downtown Tracy Station Parking Alternative 2) would result in the same less-than-significant impact as the proposed Downtown Tracy Station.