

3.11 Population and Housing

3.11.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Regional Setting

Population

Amador County had a population of 35,100 in 2000 (USCB 2000a). The County population had increased to 37,943 by early 2008, a growth of eight percent (ALAF 2008). The main population centers are the County's incorporated cities, which are listed in Table 3.11-1.

Housing

Residential areas are located throughout Amador County, and are concentrated in the cities and unincorporated communities of the County. Residential growth has occurred in areas throughout the County, but has been concentrated predominantly in the Sutter Creek area. Lone, Plymouth, Sutter Creek, Martell, Pine Grove, and Buckhorn are expected to undergo growth in the future (ALAF 2008). There were 17,116 residential units in Amador County in 2006 (USCB 2006). The average number of persons per household in 2008 was 2.3 (ALAF 2008).

Local Setting

Population

The City of Lone had a total population of 7,241 in 2000 (Amador County 2005). The household population was 2,898, while the group quarters population was 4,231 (USCB 2000b). Group quarters include medical facilities, group homes, military facilities, and correctional facilities (e.g., Preston Youth Correctional Facility and Mule Creek State Prison). The estimated non-incarcerated population of Lone was 3,119 in 2005, and is anticipated to be 3,260 in 2010 (City of Lone 2005).

Housing

The City of Lone had approximately 1,155 residential units in 2000. The average number of persons per household in 2000 was 2.68 in the City of Lone (USCB 2000a). It was estimated that there were 1,320 residential units in Lone in 2003 (City of Lone 2005).

Table 3.11-1: Population of Incorporated Cities in Amador County

City	Population (2000)
Amador	201
Lone	7,241 ¹
Jackson	4,467
Plymouth	957
Sutter	2,342
Total Incorporated Population	15,181
Notes:	
¹ Includes Mule Creek Prison inmate population of 3,650	

SOURCE: Amador County 2005

3.11.2 REGULATORY SETTING

Federal Regulations

There are no relevant federal regulations for assessment of population and housing.

State Regulations

There are no relevant state regulations for assessment of population and housing.

Local Regulations

Amador County General Plan

The Amador County General Plan Housing Element goal is to supply a variety of housing that is affordable and accessible to all County residents. Various implementation programs include identifying parcels with available or anticipated water and sewer service, and pursuing funding and preparing a plan for funding infrastructure improvements.

City of Lone General Plan

The City of Lone General Plan Housing Program Element (City of Lone 2009) defines goals and policies that promote the preservation and rehabilitation of existing neighborhoods. The primary issues identified are:

- Preserve Lone's overall identity and character by supporting a mix of housing types which preserve and complement the City's existing housing supply.
- Encourage decent, safe, adequate, and affordable housing in sufficient quantities for all economic segments of the community.
- Ensure availability of adequate housing for special needs groups including elderly, disabled, large families, female heads of households and the homeless.
- Promote affordability of housing of all types to meet the needs of households of all income levels.

3.11.3 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The proposed project would result in a significant impact if it would:

- 1) 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)
- 2) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere

3.11.4 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Potential Impact 3.11-1: The potential to induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

Overview of Impacts

Non-local construction workers would temporarily increase the population of the Lone area; however, once the construction phase is completed, these construction workers are anticipated to

leave the area. Impact from the temporary relocation of construction workers would be temporary and less than significant.

One of the objectives of the proposed project is to increase capacity for treatment and disposal of wastewater in order to accommodate future growth in lone and to meet the City's wastewater treatment and disposal needs to the 2030 planning horizon of the City's General Plan. The increased treatment capacity would not induce population growth, but rather would allow for population growth that has been anticipated and reviewed under the City's General Plan.

Existing Infrastructure – Pond 7

Construction. The initial construction of Pond 7 in 2001 involved 5 workers and was completed in 3 weeks. The subsequent reconstruction of Pond 7 in 2006 involved 10 workers and took approximately 45 days to complete. Neither phase of construction for Pond 7 resulted in substantial population growth in the lone area as any relocation of construction workers was temporary, and impacts to population and housing were less than significant.

Operation. Operation of Pond 7 for the percolation and disposal of ARSA wastewater did not require an increase in staffing at the secondary WWTP. Operation of Pond 7 has not and would not result in substantial population growth in the lone area. Impacts were and would be less than significant.

Part I – Treatment

Phase One

Construction. A number of workers would be required for the construction of the facilities proposed in the first phase of Part I. The estimated number of construction workers and approximate length of construction are summarized in Table 3.11-2, below.

These construction workers may come from outside of the immediate vicinity, or may be hired from the local area. Workers not from the local area would likely stay in hotels or in RVs in or near the City of lone. There is a rental vacancy rate of 4.4% in Amador County, which equals approximately 130 rental units (National Relocation 2007). There are also several hotels and motels throughout the County. There is sufficient temporary housing available in the lone area to accommodate these workers. Impacts to population and housing would be temporary, as workers from outside the local area are not expected to stay in lone once construction is completed. Construction of the facilities proposed in Part I would not induce substantial population growth in the area, and impacts to population and housing would be less than significant.

Element	Workers Required (Maximum)	Time Required (Approximate)
Activated Sludge System (Unenclosed, above-ground)	18	10 months
Activated Sludge System (Enclosed, underground)	66	14 months
Expanded Tertiary WWTP	18	8 months
Closure and Reclamation of Ponds 1-4	6	4 weeks
Lining and/or Partial Filling of Ponds 5 and 6	4	4 weeks
Two Pipelines Between the Secondary and Tertiary WWTP Facilities	9	4 weeks

Operation - Direct Population Growth. The existing WWTP staff would operate the new activated sludge system and expanded tertiary treatment facilities. The area of the former Ponds 1-4 would either be left in place or restored to their relatively original state, and in either case would not require staff after closure and reclamation. There would be fewer than five new jobs created for the operation of the proposed system, and impacts to population and housing from job creation would be less than significant.

The increased treatment capacity of the WWTP facilities, in tandem with the increased disposal capacity discussed below under Part II - Disposal, would allow for the development and population growth in Lone as anticipated by the General Plan. This accommodation of the growth anticipated by the 2030 General Plan planning horizon, and the related increased demands for wastewater treatment and disposal, is one of the objectives of the proposed project.

Operations - Indirect Population Growth. The initial construction phase of the activated sludge treatment system would increase the capacity enough to accommodate the City's near-term growth, with a subsequent construction phase to accommodate the City's long term growth needs. The first phase of development would involve the construction of an activated sludge treatment system with a capacity of 0.8 MGD, which would allow for approximately 2,675 residential connections (estimated for June 2021). There were approximately 1,475 residential connections in July 2008. The estimated growth in 2021 therefore represents a residential growth of approximately 181% from Lone's mid 2008 population.

Secondary wastewater treatment capacity would be further expanded to 1.60 MGD by approximately 2016 or 2017. This estimated growth represents a residential growth of approximately 362% from Lone's mid 2008 population.

The expansion of the existing tertiary treatment capacity would be required to meet the City's future wastewater treatment needs. The existing tertiary treatment capacity would be approximately doubled if the existing tertiary WWTP is expanded, increasing from 1.20 MGD to 2.40 MGD. If the City opts to instead construct a new tertiary WWTP adjacent to the activated sludge system, then the initial tertiary treatment capacity would be 0.80 MGD, which would expand to 1.60 MGD at the same time as the expansion of the activated sludge system. Regardless of which option is chosen, the tertiary WWTP would work in tandem with the expansion of the system's secondary treatment capacity.

The increased secondary and tertiary wastewater treatment capacity would not induce population growth, but rather would allow for population growth that has been anticipated and reviewed under the City's General Plan. Impacts from the expansion of the City's secondary and tertiary treatment facilities on population and housing would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Phase Two

Construction and Operation. Construction and operation of the elements from the second phase of Part I are far more limited in level of effort and potential impacts from the elements from the first phase of Part I. Construction of the expanded activated sludge system and tertiary treatment facility would require construction workers, equipment, and vehicles; however, the population growth impacts produced from these construction activities would be temporary. Operation of the expanded facilities would not require a substantial increase in the number of permanent workers at the facility.

The increased wastewater treatment capacity would not induce population growth, but rather would allow for population growth that has been anticipated and reviewed under the City's General Plan. Impacts from the expansion of the City's secondary and tertiary treatment facilities on population and housing would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Part II – Disposal

Phase One

Pond 8

Construction and Operation. Construction and operation impacts for Pond 8 would be similar as those for Pond 7, described above. Impacts to population and housing would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Phase Two

Disposal Option 1 – Disposal to Pond 9

Construction and Operation. Construction and operation impacts for Pond 9 are expected to be similar as those for Pond 7, described above. Impacts to population and housing would likely be less than significant under Disposal Option 1, and it is likely that no mitigation would be required. Mitigation, if necessary, would be defined in site-specific, project-level future CEQA review.

Disposal Option 2 – Disposal to Percolation Ponds, Charles Howard Park, and Unimin Mine

Construction. The construction of the pipeline to Charles Howard Park and Unimin Mine would require an estimated 12 to 15 workers for approximately 3 months. This pipeline construction would not induce substantial population growth, regardless of whether these construction workers were from the local area or temporarily relocated from outside the lone area. Impacts to population and housing would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Operation. Impacts from operation of the pipeline would be similar to those discussed for the pipelines between the new activated sludge system and the expanded tertiary WWTP. Impacts to population and housing would be less than significant under Disposal Option 2, and no mitigation would be required.

Disposal Option 3 – Other Potential Disposal Options

Construction and Operation. Construction and operation of additional percolation ponds would likely have impacts similar to those discussed for the construction of Pond 7. Construction and operation of additional pipelines would likely have impacts similar to those discussed for the pipelines between the new secondary sludge system and the expanded tertiary WWTP. Impacts to population and housing would likely be less than significant under Disposal Option 3, and it is likely that no mitigation would be required. Further CEQA analysis would need to be completed at a project level to determine the level of significance of Disposal Option 3 on population growth.

Part III – Storage

Construction and Operation. Construction and operation of pipelines would likely have impacts similar to those discussed for the construction and operation of the pipelines between the new secondary sludge system and the expanded tertiary WWTP, and would likely have less than significant impacts to population and housing. Estimation of impacts from the construction and operation of storage facilities is speculative as the City has not explored the size or location of possible reservoirs or other storage facilities. Determining impacts to population and housing from the construction and operation of storage facilities would be speculative, and would need to be determined during future CEQA review.

Potential Impact 3.11-2: The potential to displace substantial numbers of existing housing or numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Overview of Impacts

The proposed locations of the various project elements would not displace any existing housing or numbers of people. The proposed project would have no impact related to the displacement of housing or people.

Existing Infrastructure-Pond 7

Construction. Pond 7 was not constructed in an area that was used for housing. It did not displace housing or people. There was no impact related to the displacement of housing that would have resulted in the need for construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Operation. Percolation of ARSA wastewater in Pond 7 did not and does not involve additional ground disturbance or the displacement of housing or people. There was no impact related to the displacement of housing or people that would have resulted in the need for construction of replacement housing elsewhere, and no mitigation would be required.

Part I – Treatment

Construction. Construction of project elements related to wastewater treatment in phases one and two would not involve additional ground disturbance or the displacement of housing because all activities would take place in the existing footprints or areas not presently used for housing. There would be no impact related to the displacement of housing or people that would result in the need for construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Operation. Operation of the wastewater treatment project elements would not involve additional ground disturbance or displacement of housing. There would be no impact related to the displacement of housing that would result in the need for construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Part II – Disposal

Phase One

Pond 8

Construction. Pond 8 would not be located on areas currently used for housing. There would be no impact related to the displacement of housing, and no mitigation would be required.

Operation. Percolation of wastewater in Pond 8 would not involve additional ground disturbance or the displacement of housing. There would be no impact related to the displacement of housing, and no mitigation would be required.

Phase Two

Disposal Option 1 – Disposal to Pond 9, and Disposal Option 2 – Disposal to Charles Howard Park and Unimin Mine

Construction. Ponds 9 would likely not be located on areas currently used for housing, and any pipeline to Charles Howard Park and Unimin Mine would likely be constructed in existing roadway and railway rights of way and agricultural areas, none of which are used for housing. Construction of Pond 9 and construction along any of the pipeline routes is not expected to involve

displacement of housing. Mitigation measure Population and Housing-1 is expected to reduce housing displacement impacts to a less than significant level.

Population and Housing-1: Additional percolation ponds and pipelines for disposal of wastewater shall be sited in areas not used or planned for use for residential purposes to the extent feasible.

Further CEQA analysis would need to be performed at the project level to determine the significance of pond or pipeline construction impacts on housing.

Operation. Percolation of wastewater in Pond 9 would not involve additional ground disturbance or the displacement of housing. The pipeline to Unimin Mine and Charles Howard Park would be underground, and its operation would not displace housing or people. There would be no impact related to the displacement of housing or people that would result in the need for construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Disposal Option 3 – Other Potential Disposal Options

Construction. Construction of additional percolation ponds and pipelines could potentially displace housing if they were sited in an area currently used for housing. Impacts could be significant if percolation ponds and pipelines were sited in residential neighborhoods and were aboveground, causing the displacement of housing or people. This impact would likely be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measure Population and Housing-1. Further CEQA analysis would need to be performed at the project level to determine the significance of pond and/or pipeline construction impacts on housing.

Operation. Percolation of wastewater in additional percolation ponds and the operation of additional pipelines would not involve additional ground disturbance or the displacement of housing or people. There would be no impact related to the displacement of housing that would result in the need for construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Part III – Storage

Lone Water Reservoir and Preston Reservoir

Construction. Impacts from construction of a pipeline to the existing Lone Water Reservoir or Preston Reservoir would be similar to those described under construction of additional pipelines in Part II, Disposal Option 3. Mitigation measure Population and Housing-1 would likely reduce housing displacement impacts to a less than significant level.

Operation. Impacts from the operation of a pipeline would be similar to those described under operation of additional pipelines in Part II, Disposal Option 3. There would be no impact related to the displacement of housing that would result in the need for construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Other Water Reservoir

Construction. Impacts from construction of a pipeline to an as-of-yet unidentified or new reservoir would be similar to those described under construction of additional pipelines in Part II, Disposal Option 3. Mitigation measure Population and Housing-1 would be used to reduce impacts to less than significant.

Determining the impact of the construction of a new wastewater storage reservoir would be speculative, and therefore the impact is not carried forward for analysis. Site-specific CEQA analysis would be required at a later date if the City of Lone chooses to pursue this option, and site-specific impacts and mitigation measures would be outlined in that analysis.

Operation. Impacts from operation of a pipeline would be similar to those described under operation of additional pipelines in Part II, Disposal Option 3. There would likely be no impact related to the displacement of housing that would result in the need for construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Further CEQA analysis would need to be performed at the project level to determine the significance of reservoir operation impacts on housing displacement.