

8.7 Socioeconomics

Socioeconomic issues relevant to the affected environment include population, housing, and employment. The socioeconomic analysis also includes consideration of environmental justice, a determination of whether any project impacts fall disproportionately on a low-income or minority population. Several areas of interest and concern related to socioeconomics apply to the proposed Chevron Richmond Refinery Power Plant Replacement Project (PPRP, or the Project), as discussed below.

8.7.1 Introduction

Chevron is proposing the PPRP to add an additional 60 megawatts (MW) net generation to its existing refinery electrical generation located within Chevron's Richmond Refinery in the City of Richmond (see Figure 1.2-1) in Contra Costa County, California. The proposed PPRP will be integrated into Chevron's plans to meet its growing refinery electrical load, and produce steam to replace an existing boiler plant that is approaching its end of life. The PPRP is a subset of the larger Richmond Refinery Renewal Project that is concurrently undergoing California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review by the City of Richmond. The California Energy Commission (CEC) has jurisdiction for only the PPRP portion of the Renewal Project that is the subject of this application.

The PPRP will consist of the following components:

- A nominal 43-MW net, natural gas- or liquid petroleum gas (butane)-fired cogeneration train consisting of one combustion turbine generator (CTG), a refinery fuel gas-fired heat recovery steam generator, 13.8-kV switchgear and ancillary equipment.
- Shutdown of the existing No. 1 power plant refinery steam boilers currently providing steam to the Refinery.
- A 17-MW net extraction, condensing steam turbine generator (STG), an associated cooling tower, and 12-kV switchgear installed as part of the new hydrogen production facility (the remainder of the hydrogen plant is under CEQA review as part of the Renewal Project). The new hydrogen plant will be a net generator of steam for both the STG and the Refinery steam system.
- Reconductoring of approximately 4,000 feet of existing onsite double-circuit overhead 115-kV transmission line to upgrade its ampacity. The reconductoring will reuse existing transmission line structures.
- Adjacent onsite service connections for fuel, reclaimed water, water, wastewater, steam, and electricity to existing piperacks, with the exception of the reconductoring noted above.

The Cogen 3000 portion of the PPRP will occupy approximately 0.5 acre within an existing 5.2-acre cogeneration facility, and the STG and associated equipment (H₂-STG) will occupy approximately 0.5 acre within a new 7.9-acre hydrogen plant that will be built as part of the Richmond Refinery Renewal Project. The PPRP will be located well within the heart of the existing 2,900-acre Richmond Refinery. Temporary construction laydown and parking for the PPRP will be provided in various existing laydown areas within the Refinery that are

currently used for ongoing maintenance and project laydown. A complete description of the PPRP is provided in Section 2.0.

8.7.2 Affected Environment

The Chevron Richmond Refinery is located along the western edge of the City of Richmond, in Contra Costa County, California. The approximately 2,900-acre Refinery occupies most of the Point San Pablo Peninsula with east and south boundaries in the vicinities of the residential communities of North Richmond and Point Richmond, respectively. The Refinery is located west of Castro Street and mostly to the north of Interstate 580 (I-580). The Project is located within the Chevron Richmond Refinery (see Figure 2.1-1).

8.7.2.1 Demographic Characteristics

Population. Contra Costa County encompasses approximately 732 square miles (land area) located along the eastern edge of San Francisco Bay, and the southern edge of San Pablo Bay and the Carquinez Strait. It is one of the nine counties that comprise the Bay Area (Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma Counties) (Association of Bay Area Governments [ABAG], 2006). The Project is located within 6 miles of both Alameda and Marin Counties.

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, Contra Costa County had a total population of 948,816 persons, with a 2005 population estimate of 1,017,787 persons. Alameda County is located approximately 4 miles from the Project site and had a total population of 1,443,741 persons, with a 2005 population estimate of 1,421,308 persons. Marin County, located two and one-half miles from the Project site had a total population of 247,289 persons in 2000, with a 2005 population estimate of 235,609 persons (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006b).

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the City of Richmond had a total population of approximately 99,220 persons, with a 2005 population estimate of approximately 102,330 persons. From 1990 to 2000, the population of Richmond grew by 13 percent to a total of 99,216 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). This population increase was slightly lower than the 17 percent growth the city experienced in the previous decade. Richmond's steady population growth over the last 20 years resulted from intense residential development in the El Sobrante, Hilltop, Brickyard Cove, and Marina Bay planning areas. The growth rate in Richmond from 1990 to 2000 was slightly lower than in Contra Costa County as a whole, which experienced an 18 percent increase during the same decade. The Project site is located within census tract 3780, which had a population of 2,895 in 2000 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006).

ABAG projects that the population of the City of Richmond will grow from 100,500 in 2005 to 105,100 in 2015, an increase of 4.6 percent. ABAG projects a higher growth rate of about 8.5 percent for Contra Costa County during the same ten-year span (2005 to 2015), from 1,016,300 in 2005 to 1,102,300 in 2015. ABAG projects that the population of the City of Richmond will reach 119,900 (a 19.3 percent increase from 2005) and that the population of the County will increase to 1,244,800 by 2030 (a 22.5 percent increase from 2005) (ABAG, 2006).

Environmental Justice. On February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued "Executive Order 12898 on Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations." The Order is designed to focus attention on environmental

and human health conditions in areas of high minority populations and low-income communities, and to promote nondiscrimination in programs and projects substantially affecting human health and the environment (Federal Register, 1994). The Order requires the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and all other federal agencies (as well as state agencies receiving federal funds) to develop strategies to address this issue. The agencies are required to identify and address any disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and/or low-income populations.

The ethnic and income distribution by census tract within a 6-mile radius of the Project site (see Figure 8.7-1) are provided in Tables 8.7-1 and 8.7-2 (located at the end of this section), respectively. Data for both of these tables were taken from 2000 U.S. Census data, as specified in the USEPA Guidelines (Guidelines) for use in an environmental justice analysis (USEPA, 1996). According to the Guidelines, a minority population exists if minorities comprise 50 percent or more of the affected area's general population. The distribution of minority and Hispanic-origin populations within a 6-mile radius of the proposed Project site is summarized in Table 8.7-1. As shown in Table 8.7-1, a minority population exists in 60 percent of the census tracts.

Housing. There were currently approximately 35,928 housing units in the City of Richmond in 2000. There are approximately 354,577 housing units in Contra Costa County, 552,258 housing units in Alameda County, and 106,598 housing units in Marin County (ESA, 2006).

The average household size in Richmond in 2000 was 2.82 persons per household, which was slightly higher than the Contra Costa County average of 2.72 persons per household (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). Average household size has increased in both Richmond and in Contra Costa County since 1990, when it was 2.63 and 2.64 persons, respectively (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006).

New housing authorizations for Contra Costa County totaled 5,639 units in 2000. Of the 5,639 new housing authorizations, 4,344 units were single-family units and 1,295 were multi-family units. These authorizations were valued at \$1.2 million (California Department of Finance [DOF], 2006). According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the median value of owner-occupied housing units was \$267,800. The vacancy rate declined from 5 percent in 1990 to 3 percent in 2000.

Employment and Economy. During the early 1990s, Richmond, like much of the San Francisco Bay Area, experienced a decrease in overall employment due to a national economic recession and the closure of local military bases. As the local and regional economy strengthened toward the middle and end of the decade, the number of employed residents in Richmond increased by almost 9 percent from 1995 to 2000, and ABAG projected steady growth in the future. ABAG projects that the number of jobs in Richmond will increase from 39,290 in 2005 to 42,620 in 2010 (8.5 percent growth), 51,820 in 2020 (31.9 percent growth from 2005), and 61,090 in 2030 (55.5 percent growth from 2005). The number of jobs in Contra Costa County is expected to grow from 373,000 in 2005 to 406,010 in 2010 (9 percent growth), 472,830 in 2020 (26.8 percent growth from 2005), and 543,860 in 2030 (45.8 percent growth from 2005) (ABAG, 2006).

According to the 2000 Census, 42,769 Richmond residents were employed in 2000, 39 percent of whom worked within Contra Costa County (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006a). The Chevron Richmond Refinery currently employs approximately 1,170 full-time permanent employees and approximately 400 contract workers (ESA, 2006). Employment data for the City of Richmond, surrounding Counties, and California is shown in Table 8.7-3.

TABLE 8.7-3
Employment Data, 2006

Area	Labor Force	Employment	Unemployment	Unemployment Rate (%)
City of Richmond	50,500	47,400	3,100	6.7
Contra Costa County	519,500	500,000	19,500	3.8
Alameda County	757,700	727,400	30,300	4.0
Marin County	132,000	127,900	4,100	3.1
California	17,863,600	17,106,900	756,700	4.2

Source: California Employment Development Department (CEDD), 2006.

Details of the characteristics of the regional labor force are shown in Table 8.7-4. It shows 2001 employment data for the City of Richmond, Alameda County, Contra Costa County, and Marin County compared to California as a whole. Unemployment rates are higher in the City of Richmond (6.7 percent) than they are at the state level (4.2 percent).

Unemployment rates are lower in Alameda County (4.0 percent), Contra Costa County (3.8 percent), and Marin County (3.1 percent) than they are in the City of Richmond.

8.7.2.1.1 Project Work Force

Construction Work Force. Construction of the Project will require approximately 19 months for the Cogen 3000 project construction and 7 months for the H₂-STG construction. The construction personnel requirements for Cogen 3000 are shown in Table 8.7-4. As presented in Table 8.7-4, there will be an average and peak workforce of approximately 124 and 180, respectively, of construction craft people, supervisory, support, and construction management personnel onsite during construction of the Cogen 3000 project.

The construction personnel requirements for the H₂-STG construction are shown in Table 8.7-5.

Operations Work Force. Commercial operation is expected to commence no later than second quarter 2009. The Project is expected to operate using Chevron Richmond Refinery current employees.

8.7.2.1.2 Fiscal Resources

The initial capital cost is estimated at \$100 million. The estimated value of materials and supplies that will be purchased locally (within Contra Costa County) during construction is expected to be about \$60 million. The total local sales tax expected during construction is about \$4.5 million (that is, 7.75 percent of local sales). The Project will provide about \$40 million in construction payroll.

TABLE 8.7-4
Cogen 3000 Construction Personnel by Discipline

Job Category	Months After Notice to Proceed																			Totals
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
Mechanical							68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	884
Civil	33	33	33	33	33	33														198
Electrical & Instrumentation and Controls								33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	396
Insulation														33	33	33	33	33	33	198
Paint														16	16	16	16	16	16	96
Scaffold							15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	195
Craft Subtotal	33	33	33	33	33	33	83	116	116	116	116	116	116	165	165	165	165	165	165	1967
Construction Manager	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	285
Total Project	48	48	48	48	48	48	98	131	131	131	131	131	131	180	180	180	180	180	180	2252

TABLE 8.7-5
H₂-STG Construction Personnel by Discipline

Job Category	Months after Notice to Proceed									Totals
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
Insulation Workers								2		2
Boilermakers										0
Carpenters		6								6
Electricians							2	4		6
Ironworkers		4						4		8
Laborers					1	1	1	1		4
Millwrights				2	6	10	10			28
Operating Engineers				1	1	1	1	1		5
Painters								1		1
Pipefitters						6	6			12
Craft Subtotal	0	10	0	3	8	18	20	13	0	72
Management		1		1	1	2	3	3		11
Engineering		1		1	1	1	1	1		6
Clerical		1		1	1	1	1	1		6
Staff Subtotal	0	3	0	3	3	4	5	5	0	23
Total Project	0	13	0	6	11	22	25	18	0	95

8.7.2.2 Public Services

This section describes public services in the Project area.

Law Enforcement. The Plant Protection Department of the Refinery provides security response for the Refinery. Plant Protection is responsible for maintaining access control into and out of the Refinery; conducting internal traffic control; investigating internal motor vehicle accidents, thefts, and drug and alcohol cases; and conducting contraband inspections (ESA, 2006). During the morning and afternoon peak traffic periods when major Refinery turnarounds occur, and also during large construction projects, Plant Protection hires (on an overtime basis) the Richmond Police Department to provide traffic control at contractor gates (ESA, 2006).

The Richmond Police Department is located at 401 27th Street. The staffing varies depending on the time of day and day of week. Most personnel work during normal business hours, with the fewest working on weekends, swing shift, and graveyard. The Department's current authorized strength is 206 sworn personnel (ESA, 2006). Of the department's fifteen police beats, one covers the geographic area in which the Refinery is

located. Approximately 1.13 percent of that beat's activities are associated with serving the Refinery on an active or stand-by basis (ESA, 2006).

Depending on availability of personnel and the type of call, the Police Department's response to calls is based on a system of priorities. It maintains a response time of 3 to 5 minutes or less for top priority calls (for example, robberies in progress and imminent danger to life). The Refinery will continue to be operated as currently implemented.

Fire Protection. The Plant Protection Department of the Chevron Richmond Refinery also operates a fire department. The City of Richmond Fire Department responds to fire and emergency medical events at the Refinery only when called by the Chevron Fire Department, which occurs six or fewer times a year (ESA, 2006). When called, the City of Richmond Fire Department responds with three engines, one truck, and a Battalion Chief. In most instances in which the City Fire Department is called, it is called to be on standby at a Chevron Fire Station and provides backup while Chevron Richmond Refinery firefighters are handling the emergency. Over the last 10 years the City Fire Department has actually helped respond to an emergency on five occasions (ESA, 2006).

The Chevron Richmond Refinery Fire Department consists of 38 uniformed personnel. This organization is supplemented by a 75-person volunteer fire brigade. All of these people are trained in responding to emergencies associated with an oil refinery. The department has 21 vehicles equipped to respond to emergencies. These vary from fire engines to quick-attack vehicles. Over the last 3 years, the average response time to any location in the Refinery has been 2 minutes or less (ESA, 2006).

The current staffing of the City of Richmond Fire Department is 82 personnel. This figure includes the Fire Prevention Bureau, administrative, and secretarial staff. The Department comprises seven engine companies and one truck company (ESA, 2006).

The three City fire stations which are the first responding units to a Chevron Richmond Refinery incident are Station 61, at 108 W. Richmond in Point Richmond; Station 62, at 1065 7th Street; and Station 67, at 1131 Cutting Boulevard. Each of the three stations is staffed with three firefighters. The response time is between 2 and 5 minutes (ESA, 2006).

In addition to responding to fire, rescue, and emergency medical incidents at the Refinery, the City Fire Department makes routine and regular fire inspections. A fire inspector is assigned to the Refinery and inspects once a week for Uniform Fire Code inspections, 8 hours a quarter for State-mandated hazardous materials inspections, and as needed by contractors doing contract work in the Refinery (ESA, 2006). The Refinery will continue to be operated as currently implemented.

Hazardous Materials. The Chevron Richmond Refinery maintains an emergency response program designed to protect workers, public safety, and the environment. As part of the Emergency Response Program, there is a written plan for responding to accidental chemical releases, including procedures for notifying the public and local emergency response agencies. The program also includes the maintenance, inspection, and testing of emergency response equipment.

The Refinery has emergency response teams that are trained and equipped to respond to fires, rescues, hazardous material releases, and other emergencies that could occur at the

Refinery. These teams are managed by the Supervisor of Fire Protection, whose responsibility it is to ensure that the Emergency Response Plan is implemented and followed in the preparation for, and response to, emergencies at the Refinery.

As part of the Emergency Response Program, the Chevron Richmond Refinery works with local emergency responders in preparing for and responding to emergencies. This includes conducting emergency drills with the City's Fire Department and/or Contra Costa County Health Services on potential fires and/or hazardous materials releases.

Hospitals. There are eight hospitals in Contra Costa County. The closest hospital is Doctors Hospital, located 2.6 miles from the Refinery.

Doctors Hospital is a 100-bed facility serving the City of Richmond and other surrounding communities. Although Doctors Hospital does not have a trauma center, it can handle minor injuries. The Doctors Medical Center and Memorial Medical Center has a 24-hour Emergency department, equipped with an onsite helicopter pad.

Water Supply and Wastewater Systems. Potable water is provided to the City of Richmond by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). EBMUD obtains approximately 90 percent of its municipal water supply from the Mokelumne River, and 10 percent originates as runoff from the protected watershed lands in the East Bay area. The water supply system consists of a network of reservoirs, aqueducts, water treatment plants, pumping plants, and distribution facilities. Annual precipitation and stream flow in the Mokelumne River watershed are extremely variable from month to month and from year to year. Approximately 1.3 million people are served by EBMUD's water system in the District's 331-square-mile service area (ESA, 2006).

The Project site is served by the Richmond Sewer District, which is one of three sewer districts that service areas within Richmond. The Richmond Sewer District is managed by Veolia Water, a private water services company specializing in the outsourced management of water services for municipal or industrial customers. The Richmond Sewer District has a wet weather design capacity of 40 million gallons per day (mgd) and a dry weather design capacity of 16 mgd. Operation of the treatment plant has shown that it has adequate capacity to meet secondary treatment for discharge flows up to 18 mgd.

The wastewater collection system in Richmond consists of a 250-mile network of pipes, 18 to 19 lift/pump stations, and associated infrastructure that carry wastewater from homes and businesses to the Richmond Water Pollution Control Plant located at 601 Canal Boulevard, Richmond. The plant utilizes secondary treatment with activated sludge.

Telephone. AT&T provides telephone service to most of the City of Richmond.

8.7.3 Environmental Consequences

8.7.3.1 Environmental Checklist

The checklist shown in Table 8.7-6 is used by the CEC to assess the significance of potential impacts.

TABLE 8.7-6
Population and Housing Socioeconomic Impacts

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the Project 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)?				X
b) Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Would the Project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
d) Does a demographic analysis indicate a significant minority or low-income population within a 6-mile radius of the Project that may be subject to disproportionate adverse effects of the Project?			X	

This section analyzes the distributional patterns of high-minority and low-income populations on a regional basis and characterizes the distribution of such populations adjacent to the proposed Project area. This analysis focuses mainly on whether the proposed Project has the potential to affect area(s) of high-minority population(s) and low-income communities disproportionately, and thus would potentially create an adverse environmental justice impact. According to Executive Order 12898, an environmental justice impact would be considered significant and would require mitigation if the construction or operation of the Project would cause any minority or low-income population to bear a disproportionate share of an adverse impact.

8.7.3.2 Impacts

The Project will require approximately 19 months for construction. There would be an average and peak construction workforce of 124 and 180 workers, respectively. The majority of construction workers are expected to come from the local area or commute from the greater Bay Area counties and cities. Since the construction duration is relatively short, and local workforce is sufficient, it is not expected that construction workforce would relocate to the area during the construction period. No impact, therefore, would occur on population growth in the Project area.

The workforce in the region will be adequate to fulfill the Project's labor requirements for construction. The Project will require a construction work force that is available regionally, with most workers expected to commute to the Project site from existing residences. Short-term increases in lodging and dining business from construction workers also will provide a benefit to the local economy.

The Contra Costa County 2005 population is estimated at approximately 1,017,787, with 577,314 households (DOF, 2006). According to the State of California Department of Finance, there was a 3.0 percent housing vacancy rate in Contra Costa County in 2002, yielding over 7,700 available housing units (DOF, 2006). Since it is expected that most workers would commute to the Project site, this would have minimal impact on the housing supply. No impact, therefore, would occur on existing housing in the Project area.

Since Project operations would not require additional workers, the PPRP would not alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the population of the City of Richmond or Contra Costa County. The Project would not induce significant population growth in the area, nor would it involve the displacement of housing or people. The Project, therefore, would not result in any significant adverse impacts to population or housing.

As discussed in Section 8.7.2.1 and shown on Table 8.7-1, a “minority population” (i.e., minorities comprise 50 percent or more of the population, per the USEPA Guidelines [USEPA, 1996]) exists in 60 percent of the census tracts within a 6-mile radius of the Project site. There are no significant impacts to minority populations, however, in terms of Air Quality, Noise, Public Health, Traffic, and Visual Resources. (See Sections 8.1, 8.5, 8.6, 8.9 and 8.10, respectively, for these analyses). The minority populations, therefore, would not be impacted by the PPRP.

Because the Guidelines do not give a percentage of the population as a threshold to determine the existence of a “low-income population,” the 50 percent rule required for minority populations was used. As shown in Table 8.7-2, low-income population in the affected area does not exist. Thus, any potential impacts from Air Quality, Noise, Public Health, Traffic, and Visual Resources would not disproportionately affect a low-income population in the Project area.

8.7.4 Cumulative Impacts

The Project would result in the intermittent presence of an expected average workforce of approximately 124 during the 19-month construction, with a peak workforce of 180. The temporary addition of this construction workforce would not be considered a significant impact of the Project. While other local projects may, in combination with the Project, result in a large increase in temporary construction workers in the Project area, adequate labor exists in the Bay Area to fill most of the jobs the Project would create, but a fraction of the jobs created by the Project and other cumulative projects could be filled temporarily from outside the Bay Area. The Project would not induce significant population growth in the area, nor would it involve the displacement of housing or people. The Project’s contribution to cumulative population growth and associated housing impacts, therefore, would not be cumulatively considerable, and would not result in any significant adverse impacts to population or housing. The Project does not have any cumulative socioeconomic impacts.

8.7.5 Mitigation Measures

No specific socioeconomic mitigation measures are required.

8.7.6 Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards

8.7.6.1 Federal

8.7.6.1.1 Executive Order 12898

As previously discussed in Section 8.7.2.1, President Clinton issued “Executive Order 12898 on Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations” on February 11, 1994. The Order is designed to focus attention on environmental and human health conditions in areas of high minority populations and low-income communities, and to promote nondiscrimination in programs and projects substantially affecting human health and the environment (Federal Register, 1994). The Order requires the USEPA and all other federal agencies (as well as state agencies receiving federal funds) to develop strategies to address this issue. The agencies are required to identify and address any disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and/or low-income populations.

8.7.6.1.2 Environmental Justice Implementation Plan

In 1996, the USEPA’s Office of Environmental Justice released the *Environmental Justice Implementation Plan*, supplementing the USEPA’s environmental justice strategy and providing a framework for developing specific plans and guidance for implementing Executive Order 12898. In 1998, federal agencies received a framework for the assessment of environmental justice in the USEPA’s *Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in the EPA’s National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Compliance Analysis*. This framework emphasizes the importance of selecting an analytical process appropriate to the unique circumstances of the potentially affected community.

8.7.6.2 State

California Code of Regulations, Section 15131, stipulates the following:

- Economic or social factors of a project may be used to determine the significance of physical changes caused by the Project.
- Economic, social, and particularly housing factors shall be considered by public agencies, together with technological and environmental factors, in deciding whether changes in a project are feasible to reduce and/or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

8.7.6.2.1 California Government Code

Section 65040.12 of the California Government Code states that “Environmental justice means fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies.”

While several California state agencies have used the USEPA’s *Environmental Justice Implementation Plan* (USEPA, 1996) as a basis for the development of their own

environmental justice strategies and policies, the majority of these agencies do not yet have guidance for incorporating environmental justice impact assessment into the CEQA analysis. For example, the California Air Resources Board examined this issue and received advice from legal counsel in a memorandum entitled “CEQA and Environmental Justice” (California Air Resources Board [CARB], 2002). This memorandum states, in part:

“... [W]e would conclude that the CEQA can readily be adapted to the task of analyzing cumulative impacts/environmental justice whenever a public agency (including the California Air Resources Board, the air pollution control districts, and general purpose land use agencies) undertakes or permits a project or activity that may have a significant adverse impact on the physical environment. All public agencies in California are currently obliged to comply with the CEQA, and no further legislation would be needed to include an environmental justice analysis in the CEQA documents prepared for the discretionary actions that the public agencies undertake.”(CARB, 2002)

8.7.6.2.2 Assembly Bill

Under Assembly Bill (AB) 1553, signed into law in October 2001, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research is required to adopt guidelines for addressing environmental justice issues in local agencies’ general plans. Currently, the Office of Planning and Research is in the process of updating the General Plan Guidelines to incorporate the requirements of AB 1553.

8.7.6.2.3 Environmental Justice Policy

The California State Lands Commission (CSLC) has developed and adopted an Environmental Justice Policy to ensure equity and fairness in its own processes and procedures. The CSLC adopted an amended Environmental Justice Policy on October 1, 2002, to ensure that “environmental justice is an essential consideration in its processes, decisions and programs and that all people who live in California have a meaningful way to participate in these activities” (CSLC, 2002). The policy stresses equitable treatment of all members of the public and commits to considering environmental justice in its processes, decision-making, and regulatory affairs. The policy is implemented, in part, by identifying and communicating with relevant populations that could be adversely and disproportionately affected by CSLC projects or programs, and by ensuring that a range of reasonable alternatives is identified that would minimize or eliminate environmental impacts affecting such populations. This discussion is provided in this document consistent with and in furtherance of the CSLC’s Environmental Justice Policy. The staff of the CSLC is required to report back to the Commission on how environmental justice is integrated into its programs, processes, and activities (ESA, 2007).

8.7.7 Permits Required

No permits specific to socioeconomics are required.

8.7.8 Involved Agencies and Agency Contacts

No agencies were involved or contacted specific to socioeconomics.

8.7.9 References

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). 2006. Internet site: <http://www.abag.ca.gov>

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2002. "CEQA and Environmental Justice." March 8.

California Department of Finance (DOF). 2006. Demographic Information, Reports and Research Papers, City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 2002, Revised 2001 with 2000 Census Counts. Internet site: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/ReportsPapers/Estimates/E5/E5-06/documents/E-5a.xls>.

California Employment Development Department (CEDD). 2006. Labor Market Info, Labor Force and Unemployment data. Online: <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/cgi/databrowsing/localAreaProfileQSResults.asp?selectedarea=California&selectedindex=0&menuChoice=localAreaPro&state=true&geogArea=0601000000&countyName=>

California State Lands Commission (CSLC). 2002. *Environmental Justice Policy*. Online: http://www.slc.ca.gov/Policy_Statements/Environmental_Justice_Home_Page.html; accessed May 9, 2007.

Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). 1997. *Environmental Justice Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act*.

ESA Associates, Inc. (ESA). 2006. *Chevron Energy and Hydrogen Renewal Project Administrative Draft EIR* (State Clearinghouse No. 2005072117). Prepared for City of Richmond, CA. October.

_____. 2007. *Richmond Advanced Recycled Expansion Water Project Draft EIR* (State Clearinghouse No. 2006042142). Prepared for East Bay Municipal Utility District. January.

Federal Register Vol. 59. No. 32. Wednesday, February 16, 1994. White House, Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations*, 1994.

United States Census Bureau. 2006a. *2000 Housing Data*. http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/AdvGeoSearchByListServlet?_command=getPlacenames&_programYear=50&_geoAreaType=050&_treeId=420&_disp_order=1004&_geoIdsHierarchy=&_currentGeoAreaType=&_lang=en

_____. 2006b. *2000 Census of Population*. http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/AdvGeoSearchByListServlet?_command=getPlacenames&_programYear=50&_geoAreaType=140&_treeId=420&_disp_order=1007&_currentGeoAreaType=040&_geoIdsHierarchy=60279822&_lang=en

_____. 1998. *Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA's NEPA Compliance Analyses*. April.

_____. 1996. *Environmental Justice Implementation Plan*. April.

TABLE 8.7-1
Distribution of Minority and Hispanic-Origin Populations within a Six-Mile Radius

Census Tract	Population	White	Minority	Percent Minority	Hispanic Origin	Percent Hispanic
Alameda County						
4201	2,339	1,575	764	33	164	7
4202	2,672	1,554	1,118	42	231	9
4203	4,386	2,267	2,119	48	294	7
4204	1,721	425	1,296	75	239	14
4205	2,152	1,283	869	40	203	9
4220	1,333	561	772	58	180	14
Contra Costa County						
3560.02	6,431	2,382	4,049	63	606	9
3591.01	9,544	3,612	5,932	62	1,094	11
3591.02	5,216	2,087	3,129	60	868	17
3592.02	6,529	3,739	2,790	43	870	13
3601	9,200	4,656	4,544	49	996	11
3602	4,980	2,514	2,466	50	635	13
3610	4,199	1,926	2,273	54	704	17
3620	2,855	1,680	1,175	41	298	10
3630	6,829	2,964	3,865	57	906	13
3640.01	5,144	1,754	3,390	66	1,747	34
3640.02	5,556	2,396	3,190	57	1,306	24
3650.01	5,519	1,212	4,307	78	629	11
3650.02	4,076	88	3,988	98	1,763	43
3660.01	4,632	739	3,893	84	1,694	37
3660.02	5,856	817	5,039	86	2,898	50
3671	5,326	698	4,628	87	774	15
3672	4,372	740	3,632	83	1,681	38
3680	9,324	992	8,332	89	5,921	64
3690.01	7,053	1,559	5,494	78	2,014	29
3690.02	2,828	1,141	1,687	60	537	19
3700	2,934	1,367	1,567	53	504	17
3710	5,266	1,656	3,610	69	1,320	25
3720	7,133	1,600	5,533	78	2,925	41
3730	4,290	498	3,792	88	2,454	57
3740	4,517	1,197	3,320	74	1,498	33
3750	4,502	267	4,235	94	2,787	62
3760	5,959	158	5,801	97	2,189	37
3770	7,596	636	6,960	92	3,864	51

TABLE 8.7-1
Distribution of Minority and Hispanic-Origin Populations within a Six-Mile Radius

Census Tract	Population	White	Minority	Percent Minority	Hispanic Origin	Percent Hispanic
3780	2,895	2,170	725	25	266	9
3790	6,329	202	6,127	97	1,488	24
3800	6,002	1,732	4,270	71	1,136	19
3810	6,222	316	5,906	95	1,461	24
3820	7,256	593	6,663	92	797	11
3830	4,486	2,149	2,337	52	575	13
3840	3,840	2,159	1,684	44	178	5
3851	2,661	1,673	988	37	119	4
3852	1,440	722	718	50	65	5
3860	3,324	1,138	2,186	66	354	11
3870	2,294	1,199	1,095	48	226	10
3880	2,536	1,362	1,174	46	281	11
3891	1,908	1,074	834	44	195	10
3892	1,631	734	897	55	255	16
3901	2,150	1,430	720	33	84	4
3902	1,664	1,201	463	28	73	4
3910	2,458	1,988	470	19	78	3
3920	2,314	1,816	498	22	88	4
Marin County						
1060.01	3,826	2,991	835	22	264	7
1060.02	5,745	4,087	1,658	29	871	15
1101	5,643	4,572	1,071	19	614	11
1102	5,432	4,859	573	11	193	4
1122	11,679	1,921	9,758	84	8,192	70
1212	5,521	4,561	960	17	307	6
1220	6,362	2,210	4,152	65	1,325	21
1230	2,106	2,000	106	5	46	2
1241	5,377	4,620	757	14	183	3
1242	5,431	4,869	562	10	221	4

Note:

Hispanics or Latinos are those people who classified themselves in one of the specific Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino categories listed on the Census 2000 questionnaire—"Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano," "Puerto Rican," or "Cuban"—as well as those who indicate that they are "other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino." People who identify their origin as "other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino" may be of any race. Thus, the Hispanic population percentage should not be added to percentages for racial (that is, minority) categories.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006b

TABLE 8.7-2
Distribution of Low-Income Population within a 6-mile Radius

Census Tract	Population	Low Income*	Percent Low-Income*
Alameda County			
4201	2,243	106	5
4202	2,768	238	9
4203	4,410	404	9
4204	1,682	358	21
4205	2,134	119	6
4220	1,255	164	13
Contra Costa County			
3560.02	6,326	188	3
3591.01	9,485	455	5
3591.02	5,183	307	6
3592.02	6,485	176	3
3601	9,139	523	6
3602	4,950	522	11
3610	4,114	393	10
3620	2,855	175	6
3630	6,805	352	5
3640.01	5,128	577	11
3640.02	5,528	292	5
3650.01	4,776	429	9
3650.02	4,069	1,578	39
3660.01	4,596	942	20
3660.02	5,790	864	15
3671	5,271	508	10
3672	4,333	766	18
3680	9,278	1,816	20
3690.01	6,646	1,043	16
3690.02	2,782	263	9
3700	2,923	171	6
3710	5,239	351	7
3720	7,059	667	9
3730	4,208	1,050	25
3740	4,486	685	15
3750	4,453	1,083	24

TABLE 8.7-2
Distribution of Low-Income Population within a 6-mile Radius

Census Tract	Population	Low Income*	Percent Low-Income*
3760	5,908	1,408	24
3770	7,480	2,322	31
3780	2,895	210	7
3790	6,216	1,825	29
3800	5,999	1,272	21
3810	6,152	1,207	20
3820	7,210	1,679	23
3830	4,475	280	6
3840	3,840	87	2
3851	2,652	71	3
3852	1,396	44	3
3860	3,329	328	10
3870	2,338	124	5
3880	2,529	219	9
3891	1,915	146	8
3892	1,595	200	13
3901	2,119	114	5
3902	1,683	106	6
3910	2,458	89	4
3920	2,300	72	3
Marin County			
1060.01	3,485	270	8
1060.02	5,269	389	7
1101	5,437	529	10
1102	5,414	116	2
1122	11,602	2,435	21
1212	5,512	367	7
1220	150	8	5
1230	2,104	113	5
1241	5,343	250	5
1242	5,349	225	4

Note:

* "Low income" population numbers are those for whom poverty was determined by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006b

