3.15 Population and Housing

3.15.1 Introduction

This section describes the regulatory setting and affected environment for population and housing within the population and housing RSA, and describes potential impacts on population and housing during construction and operation of the proposed Project. This section also identifies the potential for cumulative impacts of the proposed Project on population and housing when considered in combination with other relevant projects.

3.15.2 Regulatory Setting

This section identifies the applicable federal, state, regional, and local laws, regulations, and orders that are relevant to the analysis of population and housing. This section also addresses the proposed Project's consistency with the regulations described herein.

3.15.2.1 Federal

There are no identified federal plans, policies, and regulations that are relevant to the analysis of population and housing.

3.15.2.2 State

2018 California State Rail Plan

The 2018 California State Rail Plan is a plan to strategize the state's operational and capital investments toward its statewide travel system. The plan is considered an important element in the comprehensive planning and analysis of statewide transportation investment strategies illustrated in the California Transportation Plan 2040. Specifically, the plan calls for rerouting passenger rail service from the Niles Subdivision to the Coast Subdivision and rerouting freight operations from the Coast Subdivision to the Niles Subdivision to facilitate faster travel times.

California Transportation Plan 2040

The California Transportation Plan 2040 is a plan that outlines the goals and recommendations to achieve a vision for a safe, sustainable, universally assessable, and globally competitive transportation system in order to provide reliable and efficient mobility for people, goods, and services. The plan will also concurrently meet the State's greenhouse gas emission reduction goals and preserve the unique character of communities within the State. The California Department of Transportation completed the updated California Transportation Plan 2050; however, the 2040 Plan is utilized in order to be analyzed in parallel with the 2018 California State Rail Plan.

California Relocation Assistance Act (California Gov. Code 7260 et seq.)

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 CCR 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 or businesses, or farms by state and state-assisted programs.

3.15.2.3 Regional

2016 Capitol Corridor Vision Implementation Plan

The Capitol Corridor Vision Implementation Plan outlines the implementation of capital improvements that are needed in order to accommodate for future trends, such as population increase, business demands, and climate change trends. The plan also calls for relocating the Capitol Corridor service between Oakland and Newark to the Coast Subdivision to provide a shorter and more direct route from Oakland to San Jose. The proposed Project is a key element toward the plan's goals and objectives.

2014 Capitol Corridor Vision Plan Update

The 2014 Capitol Corridor Vision Plan Update outlines the long-term investment strategies and options for improving the speed and reliability of Capitol Corridor. It also addresses the effects of climate change and sea-level rise. The proposed Project is a key element toward the Plan's goals and objectives.

3.15.2.4 Local

The planning documents listed below guide development and land use in the Project Study Area.

- Plan Bay Area 2050 (2021).
- 2020 Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan (2020).
- Alameda Countywide Transit Plan (2016).
- Alameda County Housing Element (2015).
- City of Fremont General Plan (2011).
- City of Newark General Plan (2013).
- City of Oakland General Plan (1998).
- City of Union City General Plan (2019).
- City of Hayward General Plan (2014).
- City of San Leandro General Plan (2016).
- San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan (2004).
- Ashland and Cherryland Business District Specific Plan (2015).

Table 3.12-3 Consistency with Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations, in Section 3.12, Land Use and Planning, provides a list of applicable goals, policies, and objectives from regional and local plans of the jurisdictions in which the proposed Project would be located and the proposed Projects consistency or inconsistency with each.

Consistency with Plans, Policies, and Regulations

Section 15125(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to discuss "any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans, specific plans, and regional plans." These plans were considered during the preparation of this analysis and were reviewed to assess whether the proposed Project would be consistent with the plans of relevant jurisdictions.

The proposed Project would comply with applicable state and local laws, regulations, and orders that are relevant to the analysis of population and housing. This includes compliance with the California Relocation Assistance Act and applicable goals and policies set forth by Alameda County and all respective cities within the Project Study Area. These cities include Fremont, Hayward, Oakland, Newark, San Leandro, and Union City. The proposed Project would be generally consistent with the applicable goals, policies, and objectives related to population and housing.

Inconsistency with regional and local plans and policies are not necessarily considered a significant impact under CEQA, unless it is related to a physical impact on the environment that is significant in its own right.

Implementation of the proposed Project would create a more direct passenger rail route and significantly reduce rail travel times, which would facilitate more auto-competitive travel times for intercity rail trips. The proposed Project would also create new connections to Transbay transit services and destinations. The following regional needs would be met through implementation of the proposed Project:

- Reduce passenger rail travel time between Oakland and San Jose and throughout the larger Northern California megaregion to increase ridership on transit, ease congestion on the megaregion's stressed roadways, and reduce auto trips.
- Improve transit service between Northern California megaregional markets by enhancing connections between high demand destinations, overcoming existing geographic service gaps between job centers and affordable housing on the San Francisco Peninsula and along the Capitol Corridor route.

These Project outcomes are related to population and housing because they would result in increased travel efficiency, better connectivity amongst communities, a greater number of transportation options for the public, and greater access to housing and businesses. The proposed Project is consistent with Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority's 2014 Vision Plan Update and 2016 Vision Implementation Plan and the State's 2018 California State Rail Plan. As stated above, these plans all call for the rerouting of Capitol Corridor passenger service between Oakland and San Jose to provide a more efficient, direct passenger rail route and significantly reduce passenger rail travel time.

3.15.3 Methods for Evaluating Environmental Impacts

This section defines the population and housing RSA and describes the methods used to analyze impacts on population and housing within the RSA.

3.15.3.1 Resource Study Area

As defined in Section 3.1, Introduction, RSAs are the geographic boundaries within which the environmental investigations specific to each resource topic were conducted. The RSA for population and housing is defined as the entire Alameda County, as well as the cities and CDPs within the Project Study Area. In particular, the population and housing RSA includes the cities of Fremont, Hayward, Oakland, Newark, San Leandro, and Union City. The RSA also includes CDPs of San Lorenzo, Cherryland, and Ashland.

3.15.3.2 Data Sources

Quantitative and qualitative analyses were performed to evaluate the proposed Project's direct and indirect impacts on population and housing. Population and housing data were acquired from the Decennial Census (U.S. Census Bureau 2021a). Additional demographic data were located via the American Community Survey (ACS) table (U.S. Census Bureau 2021b) for Alameda County, cities, and CDPs in the RSA. The following tables were referenced:

- Table P1 'Race': Decennial Census Data for 2020 and 2010.
- Table DP1 'Profile of General Demographic Characteristics': Decennial Census Data for 2000.
- Table H1 'Occupancy Status': Decennial Census Data for 2020 and 2010.
- Table H003 '100-Percentage Count of Housing Units': Decennial Census Data for 2000.
- Table S1101 'Households and Families': American Community Survey Data for 2019 and 2010.

The following methods were used to evaluate the potential impacts from construction and operation of the proposed Project on population and housing:

- GIS data, aerial imagery, and static and interactive maps were used to pinpoint populated areas (residential and commercial designated areas) within the RSA.
- Construction impact analysis included review of project design mapping, including temporary ROWs, identified staging areas, and operation of the proposed Project, and their potential to induce population or impact existing housing.

The analysis considers each of the major Project components in the context of construction and post-construction operations. The analysis of population and housing characteristics considers the potential for the proposed Project to affect population and housing by inducing substantial unplanned population growth in the area or by displacing a substantial number of existing people or housing. The analysis considers and discusses the historical population trends over the past 20 years in order to analyze anticipated future development trends in the RSA.

3.15.3.3 CEQA Thresholds

To satisfy CEQA requirements, population and housing impacts were analyzed in accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. According to the CEQA Guidelines, CCR, Title 14, Section 15002(g), "a significant effect on the environment is defined as a substantial adverse change in the physical conditions which exist in the area affected by the proposed project." As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(b)(1), the significance of an activity may vary with the setting. The impact analysis identifies and analyzes construction (short-term) and operation (long-term) impacts, as well as direct and indirect impacts (see PRC Section 21065). The proposed Project would have significant Population and Housing impacts under CEQA if it would:

a. Induce substantial unplanned 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); or
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

3.15.4 Affected Environment

3.15.4.1 Environmental Setting

Regional and Local Setting

The proposed Project is in Alameda County. Within the RSA, the jurisdictions are the Cities of Fremont, Hayward, Oakland, Newark, San Leandro, and Union City as well as the CDPs of San Lorenzo, Cherryland, and Ashland. Each of the tables below presents historical and current data for Alameda County and each of the cities and CDPs within the RSA.

Table 3.15-1 presents the population trend over the past 20 years within the various geographical areas within the RSA. Based on the data shown in Table 3.15-1, all geographic areas within the RSA have experienced an increase in population (ranging from 5 to 35 percent) over the 20-year period between 2000 and 2020.

Table 3.15-2 presents regional and local housing characteristics over the past 20 years within the various geographical areas within the RSA. Based on the data shown in Table 3.15-2, all geographic areas within the RSA have experienced an increase in housing inventory over the 20-year period between 2000 and 2020. Of the available housing inventory within the RSA, the total number of occupied housing units has remained in the mid to upper 90th percentile between 2000 and 2020 for all geographic areas within the RSA. While there are fluctuations in the overall occupancy rates, these fluctuations reflect the timing and consequences of the housing crisis and Great Recession[1] of the late 2000s. For many areas of the country, the economic downturn led to sharp vacancy rate increases between the 2000 Census and 2010 Census, followed by decreases between 2010 and 2020 as housing markets recovered (Brassell 2021).

1 The Great Recession was a period between December 2007 and June 2009 that saw the 2008 financial crisis, some of the worst unemployment rates, Gross Domestic Product, and economic disasters since World War II.

Table 3.15-1: Regional and Local Population Characteristics (2000–2020)

Geography	2000	2010	2020	Percentage Change 2000–2010	Percentage Change 2010–2020	Percentage Change 2000–2020
RSA	642,578	662,009	723,637	3% (+19,431)	9% (+61,628)	13% (+81,059)
Alameda County	1,443,741	1,510,271	1,682,353	5% (+66,530)	11% (+172,082)	17% (+238,612)
City of Fremont	203,413	214,186	230,504	5% (+10,773)	8% (+16,318)	13% (+27,091)
City of Hayward	140,030	144,186	162,954	3% (+4,156)	13% (18,768)	16% (+22,924)
City of Newark	42,471	42,573	47,529	0% (+102)	12% (4,956)	12% (+5,058)
City of Oakland	399,484	390,724	440,646	-2% (-8,760)	13% (+49,922)	10% (+41,162)
City of San Leandro	79,452	84,950	91,008	7% (+5,498)	7% (+6,058)	15% (+11,556)
City of Union City	66,869	69,516	70,143	4% (+2,647)	1% (+627)	5% (+3,274)
CDPs Combined	56,528	60,105	69,212	6% (+3,577)	15% (+9,107)	22% (+12,684)
Ashland CDP	20,793	21,925	23,823	5% (+1,132)	9% (+1,898)	15% (+3,030)
Cherryland CDP	13,837	14,728	15,808	6% (+891)	7% (+1,080)	14% (+1,971)
San Lorenzo CDP	21,898	23,452	29,581	7% (+1,554)	26% (+6,129)	35% (+7,683)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2021a.
Notes:
CDP=Census Designated Place; RSA=resource study area

Table 3.15-2: Regional and Local Housing Characteristics – Occupancy (2000–2020)

Geography	2000			2010			2020		
	Total Units	Occupied Units (Occupancy Rate %)	Vacant Units (Vacancy Rate %)	Total Units	Occupied Units (Occupancy Rate %)	Vacant Units (Vacancy Rate %)	Total Units	Occupied Units (Occupancy Rate %)	Vacant Units (Vacancy Rate %)
RSA	216,327	211,442 (97.7%)	4,898 (2.3%)	228,024	214,856 (94.2%)	13,168 (5.8%)	238,283	229,730 (96.4%)	8,553 (3.6%)
Alameda County	540,183	523,366 (96.9%)	16,817 (3.1%)	582,549	545,138 (93.6%)	37,411 (6.4%)	621,958	591,636 (95.1%)	30,322 (4.9%)
City of Fremont	69,452	68,237 (98.3%)	1,215 (1.7%)	73,989	71,004 (96.0%)	2,985 (4.0%)	77,430	74,450 (96.2%)	2,980 (3.8%)
City of Hayward	45,922	44,804 (97.6%)	1,118 (2.4%)	48,296	45,365 (94.0%)	2,931 (6.0%)	52,268	50,215 (96.1%)	2,053 (3.9%)
City of Newark	13,150	12,992 (98.9%)	158 (1.2%)	13,414	12,972 (96.6%)	442 (3.4%)	15,371	14,946 (97.2%)	425 (2.8%)
City of Oakland	157,508	150,790 (95.7%)	6,718 (4.3%)	169,710	153,791 (90.6%)	15,919 (9.4%)	178,469	167,909 (94.1%)	10,560 (5.9%)
City of San Leandro	31,334	30,642 (97.8%)	692 (2.2%)	32,419	30,717 (94.7%)	1,702 (5.3%)	32,898	31,799 (96.7%)	1,099 (3.3%)

Table 3.15-2: Regional and Local Housing Characteristics – Occupancy (2000–2020)

Geography	2000			2010			2020		
	Total Units	Occupied Units (Occupancy Rate %)	Vacant Units (Vacancy Rate %)	Total Units	Occupied Units (Occupancy Rate %)	Vacant Units (Vacancy Rate %)	Total Units	Occupied Units (Occupancy Rate %)	Vacant Units (Vacancy Rate %)
City of Union City	18,877	18,642 (98.8%)	235 (1.2%)	21,258	20,433 (96.1%)	825 (3.9%)	21,911	21,432 (97.8%)	479 (2.2%)
Ashland CDP	7,372	7,223 (98.0%)	149 (2.0%)	7,758	7,270 (93.7%)	488 (6.3%)	7,992	7,701 (96.4%)	291 (3.6%)
Cherryland CDP	4,823	4,658 (96.6%)	165 (3.4%)	4,975	4,643 (93.3%)	332 (6.7%)	5,125	4,922 (96.0%)	203 (4.0%)
San Lorenzo CDP	7,609	7,500 (98.6%)	109 (1.4%)	7,674	7,425 (96.8%)	249 (3.2%)	9,198	8,991 (97.7%)	207 (2.3%)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2021a
Notes:
CDP=Census Designated Place; RSA=resource study area

3.15.5 Best Management Practices

As noted in Chapter 2, Project Alternatives, CCJPA would incorporate a range of BMPs to avoid and minimize adverse effects on the environment that could result from implementation of the proposed Project. BMPs are included in the proposed Project description, and the impact analyses were conducted assuming application of these practices.

No BMPs for population and housing are included in the proposed Project.

3.15.6 Environmental Impacts

This section describes the potential environmental impacts on population and housing as a result of the implementation of the proposed Project. Lettering shown within title for each environmental factor below correlates with CEQA Statute and Guidelines, Appendix G table lettering and numbering.

3.15.6.1 (a) Induce substantial unplanned 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?

No Project Alternative

No Impact. Under the No Project Alternative, the Capitol Corridor passenger rail service between Oakland and San Jose would not be relocated from the Niles Subdivision to the Coast Subdivision associated with the proposed Project. Improvements proposed for the Niles and Coast Subdivisions associated with the proposed Project would not occur. Capitol Corridor passenger trains would continue to operate based on current routes with no changes to rail connectivity or operational efficiency. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not result in direct impacts or changes in land use that would induce direct or indirect population growth. Areas within the RSA would experience a continuation of current development, population and housing patterns and trends, but with more limited transit options. No impacts associated with population and housing are anticipated to occur under the No Project Alternative.

Proposed Project

Construction and Operations

Less Than Significant Impact. In general, a project could result in substantial growth impacts from the addition of new or expansion of existing infrastructure or service capacity to accommodate growth that is beyond the levels currently permitted by local or regional plans and policies. In general, growth induced by a project is considered a significant impact if it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services or if it can be demonstrated that the potential growth significantly affects the environment in some other way. See further discussion in Section 5.4,, Growth Inducing Impacts.

Implementation of the proposed Project rail improvements would improve regional connectivity by creating a more direct passenger rail route and reducing the passenger rail travel time through the provision of at-grade and other rail infrastructure improvements. This would potentially increase rail ridership and allow for better connections between high-demand destinations, job centers, and affordable housing locations within the Northern California megaregion.

With the proposed improvements associated with the new Ardenwood Station, the new station facility could encourage development in the surrounding area and the potential for transit-oriented development. However, the new Ardenwood Station is within a suburbanized area, with the majority of the surrounding parcels already developed with residential, office, and business uses. While there are some vacant parcels adjacent to the site of the new Ardenwood Station, the type of development that could occur would be governed by the existing land use plan of the local jurisdiction (e.g., City of Fremont's General Plan). Any growth anticipated from the development of these vacant parcels is included as part of the City of Fremont's General Plan future growth projections. The Ardenwood Technology Park is identified in General Plan Implementation 2-5.2.A: Tech Industrial Areas as an area that is prioritized for economic development (City of Fremont 2011).

The proposed Project would not construct infrastructure (e.g., expansion of the existing road network) or result in new development that would result in direct reason substantial and unplanned population growth in the area. Implementation of the proposed Project would generate employment opportunities during the construction and operational phases of the proposed Project. While the proposed Project would generate additional employment opportunities, the majority of these jobs are expected to be filled by residents within Alameda County. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

3.15.6.2 (b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Project Alternative

No Impact. Under the No Project Alternative, the Capitol Corridor passenger rail service between Oakland and San Jose would not be relocated from the Niles Subdivision to the Coast Subdivision associated with the proposed Project. Improvements proposed for the Niles and Coast Subdivisions associated with the proposed Project would not occur. Capitol Corridor passenger trains would continue to operate based on current routes with no changes to rail connectivity or operational efficiency. Therefore, there would be no displacement of people or exiting housing that would require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impacts are anticipated under the No Project Alternative.

Proposed Project

Construction and Operations

No Impact. The majority of proposed Project improvements would occur within or adjacent to the existing UPRR right-of-way and adjacent to a pre-existing transit facility (Ardenwood Park & Ride). The proposed Project would not require any full parcel acquisitions of residential zoned property.

As a result, no residential relocations would be required under the proposed Project. Therefore, there would be no displacement of existing people or housing, which would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, resulting in no impact.

3.15.7 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures for population and housing are required for the proposed Project.

3.15.8 Cumulative Impact Analysis

Resource Study Area

The cumulative study area for population and housing includes the RSA defined for the proposed Project and the area within 2 miles of the proposed Project. The cumulative study area would capture construction and operational impacts on population and housing generated from the combined effects of planned projects and the proposed Project.

Cumulative Condition and Contribution of the Proposed Project

A significant cumulative impact on population and housing would occur if the cumulative activities, combined with the proposed Project, would result in substantial unplanned population growth in the RSA.

It is important to note that transportation improvements are but one of the many factors that influence land use decisions and development patterns. Other factors for population growth include the supply and demand for developable property (which is a fixed resource); institutional factors such as land use controls (zoning and subdivision regulations for example); and the economic health of the community. For development and redevelopment to occur, demand for developable property, supplies of developable property, and institutional requirements must be compatible and must be present at the same time and place.

Implementation of the proposed Project would improve local and regional mobility which could result in several socioeconomic and community benefits including the creation of direct and indirect job opportunities at the local and regional level. However, implementation of the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in substantial or unplanned population growth as the majority of the proposed improvements would occur in an existing and urbanized transportation corridor.

As shown in Table 3.1, Cumulative Projects List, in Section 3.1, Introduction, multiple past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects were considered for the purpose of this cumulative impact analysis. These cumulative projects include infrastructure projects, transportation and transit projects, recreational and community facility projects, and other private development projects within the proposed Project's RSA. Based on a review of environmental documents available for these cumulative projects, none of the projects identifies a cumulative population and housing impact.

Further, the proposed Project is consistent with applicable land use and planning goals and policies identified in regional and local planning documents that promote transit ridership, reduce automobile dependence, and enhance connections between job centers and affordable housing

within the RSA (Section 3.12, Land Use and Planning). All development projects, including the identified cumulative projects, would be required to comply with applicable regulations and planning standards and would be subject to the local jurisdiction planning process and environmental review as applicable. Therefore, the cumulative projects would also be subject to compliance with relevant land use plans, policies, or regulations and would otherwise require the approval of Alameda County and the respective local jurisdictions. In addition, growth and development would continue to occur within the RSA consistent with existing zoning regulations that would not be changed by the proposed Project.

Conclusion

Implementation of the proposed Project, combined with other foreseeable projects in the surrounding area, is not expected to result in significant cumulative impacts on population and housing resources.

3.15.9 CEQA Significance Findings Summary Table

Table 3.15-3 summarizes the population and housing impacts of the proposed Project.

Table 3.15-3. Population and Housing Impacts Summary

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Incremental Project Contribution to Cumulative Impacts	Mitigation	Level of Significance with Mitigation Incorporated	Incremental Project Cumulative Impact after Mitigation
(a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)?	LTS	NCC	N/A	LTS	NCC
Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	NI	NCC	N/A	NI	NCC

Notes: LTS = Less than Significant Impact, NI = No Impact, N/A = Not Applicable, NCC = Not Cumulatively Considerable.

3.15.10 References

Alameda County. 2015. County Housing Element. May 5, 2015. Accessed May 22, 2023. Available Online: https://www.acgov.org/cda/planning/generalplans/documents/CompleteHousingElementBOSAdopted050515.pdf.

Alameda County Community Development Agency. 2015. Ashland and Cherryland Business District Specific Plan. Adopted December 2015. Accessed May 22, 2023. Available Online: https://www.acgov.org/cda/planning/generalplans/documents/LWC-ACBD.pdf.

Alameda County Planning Department. 2004. San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan. October 7, 2004. Accessed May 22, 2023. Available Online: https://www.acgov.org/cda/planning/generalplans/documents/SanLorenzoSpecPlancombined.pdf.

Alameda County Transportation Commission. 2016. Alameda Countywide Transit Plan. Access July 2022. Available Online: https://www.alamedactc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/AlamedaCTC_CountywideTransitPlan.pdf.

_____. 2020. Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan 2020. Accessed July 2022. Available Online: https://www.alamedactc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/2020_CTP_Final.pdf.

Brassell, Evan. 2021. "In 2020, 9.7% of Housing Was Vacant, Down from 11.4% in 2010." August 12, 2021. Accessed May 22, 2023. Available Online: https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2021/08/unitedstates-housing-vacancy-rate-declined-in-pastdecade.html#:~:text=The%20decennial%20census%20collects%20information,was%20in%202000%20(9.0%25).

City of Fremont. 2011. General Plan– Land Use Element. December 13, 2011. Accessed May 22, 2023. Available Online: https://www.fremont.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/801/637750630860000000.

City of Hayward. 2014. Hayward 2040 General Plan Policy Document. July 2014. Accessed May 22, 2023. Available Online: https://www.haywardca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/General_Plan_FINAL.pdf.

City of Newark. 2013. General Plan. December 12, 2013. Accessed May 22, 2023. Available Online: https://www.newark.org/home/showpublisheddocument/76/636502245500200000.

City of Oakland. 2023. 2023-2031 Adopted Housing Element. February 17, 2023. Accessed May 22, 2023. Available Online: https://www.oaklandca.gov/documents/2023-2031-adopted-housing-element.

City of San Leandro. 2016. General Plan – Land Use and Housing Elements. September 19, 2016. Accessed May 22, 2023. Available Online: https://www.sanleandro.org/332/General-Plan.

City of Union City. 2015. General Plan - Housing Element. February 19, 2015. Accessed May 22, 2023. Available Online: https://www.unioncity.org/DocumentCenter/View/478/Housing-Element-PDF?bidId=.

United States Census Bureau. 2023a. Decennial Census Data. 2000, 2010, 2020. Table P1, DP1, H1, H003. Accessed May 22, 2023. Available Online: https://data.census.gov/.

_____. 2023b. American Community Survey. 2010, 2019. Table S1101. Accessed May 22, 2023. Available Online: https://data.census.gov/.