4.15 SOCIOECONOMICS

4.15.1 INTRODUCTION

This section presents a summary of the existing socioeconomic conditions in the SVRTC. Existing conditions are discussed relative to population, housing, ethnicity, income, availability of private transportation, jobs and employment, and labor force. Impacts related to residential and non-residential relocation for the Baseline Alternative are discussed. Residential and nonresidential relocation, and tunnel easements required for the BART Alternative, are also discussed.

The study area for the socioeconomic analysis aligns with the SVRTC as defined by the FTA New Starts process and encompasses an area of approximately one-half mile to one mile on each side of the corridor. The 2000 data is derived from the 2000 U.S. Census at the block group level. The 2025 projections are derived from ABAG, *Forecasts for the San Francisco Bay Area to the Year 2025*.

4.15.2 EXISTING CONDITIONS

4.15.2.1 Population, Housing, and Employment

Existing and projected population, housing, and employment for the study area, Alameda and Santa Clara counties, and the cities of Fremont, Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara are shown in Table 4.15-1.

Population. According to ABAG projections, total population in the study area is anticipated to increase by 22 percent between 2000 and 2025. This growth is greater than projected for population in Alameda County and the City of Fremont, which are anticipated to increase by 19 and 15 percent, respectively, over the same period. Population in Santa Clara County and the City of San Jose is projected to increase by 23 percent. The cities of Milpitas and Santa Clara are projected to have the most similar growth patterns to the study area with respective population increases of 38 and 31 percent.

Households. Households in the study area are expected to increase over 26 percent to 91,677 households between 2000 and 2025. By contrast, the percentage of household growth projected in both Alameda County and the City of Fremont is much lower, 17 and 13 percent, respectively. Santa Clara County and the City of San Jose both project increases slightly higher with a household growth of just under 25 percent. The City of Milpitas and the City of Santa Clara are the most comparable to the study area, with growth rates of 39 and 32 percent.

Employment. Between 2000 and 2025, jobs in the study area are anticipated to increase by 33 percent, a higher growth rate than for either population or housing. Growth rates in Alameda County and the City of Fremont would be slightly higher, with a 35 percent increase in employment opportunities. Santa Clara County and the cities of San Jose and Santa Clara would have somewhat slower employment growth than the study area, with growth rates of 28, 30, and 25 percent. Employment growth for the City of Milpitas would be higher, with a 38 percent increase in jobs.

Youth, O to 19 years. The youth population in the study area is projected to increase by 40% between 2000 and 2025. This is substantially higher than the 8% projected for Alameda County and the 16% projected for Santa Clara County.

Seniors, **65**+ **years**. The senior population in the study area is projected to substantially increase by 131% between 2000 and 2025, which is slightly lower than the increases projected for Alameda and Santa Clara counties.

The deferral of the Berryessa and Civic Plaza/SJSU stations would reduce the total population, households

| Table 4.15-1: 2000 and 2025 Population, Households, Employment and Age | | | | | | | | |

 |
 |

 |
 | | | | |
 | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|--
--
--
--

--

--
---|---|--|--|---
--|--|--|---|
| | Population Households | | | Employment (Jobs) | | | Age (Youth 0-19 Years) | |

 | Age (Senior 65 + Years)
 |

 |
 | | | | |
 | | | |
| 2000 | 2025 | Absolute
Change | Percent
Change | 2000 | 2025 | | | 2000 | 2025

 |
 |

 | 2000
 | 2025 | | | 2000 | 2025
 | Absolute
Change | Percent
Change | |
| 240,375 | 292,070 | 51,695 | 21.5% | 72,677 | 91,677 | 19,000 | 26.1% | 236,752 | 314,830

 | 78,078
 | 33.0%

 | 60,138
 | 84,028 | 23,891 | 39.7% | 27,627 | 63,926
 | 36,300 | 131.4% | |
| 1,443,741 | 1,714,200 | 270,459 | 18.7% | 523,366 | 611,680 | 88,314 | 16.9% | 751,680 | 1,014,190

 | 262,510
 | 34.9%

 | 392,243
 | 421,800 | 29,557 | 7.5% | 147,591 | 349,300
 | 201,709 | 136.7% | |
| 203,413 | 233,200 | 29,787 | 14.6% | 68,237 | 76,980 | 8,743 | 12.8% | 108,410 | 146,520

 | 38,110
 | 35.2%

 | 56,960
 | NA ^[2] | NA ^[2] | NA ^[2] | 16,967 | NA ^[2]
 | NA ^[2] | NA ^[2] | |
| 1,682,585 | 2,064,200 | 381,615 | 22.7% | 565,863 | 695,170 | 129,307 | 22.9% | 1,092,330 | 1,395,830

 | 303,500
 | 27.8%

 | 459,612
 | 531,900 | 72,288 | 15.7% | 160,527 | 394,400
 | 233,873 | 145.7% | |
| 62,698 | 86,200 | 23,502 | 37.5% | 17,132 | 23,830 | 6,698 | 39.1% | 50,280 | 69,540

 | 19,260
 | 38.3%

 | 17,059
 | NA ^[2] | NA ^[2] | NA ^[2] | 4,411 | NA ^[2]
 | NA ^[2] | NA ^[2] | |
| 894,943 | 1,096,200 | 201,257 | 22.5% | 276,598 | 344,110 | 67,512 | 24.4% | 427,670 | 554,440

 | 126,770
 | 29.6%

 | 260,652
 | NA ^[2] | NA ^[2] | NA ^[2] | 73,860 | NA ^[2]
 | NA ^[2] | NA ^[2] | |
| 102,361 | 134,000 | 31,639 | 30.9% | 38,526 | 50,800 | 12,274 | 31.9% | 135,960 | 170,260

 | 34,300
 | 25.2%

 | 23,560
 | NA ^[2] | NA ^[2] | NA ^[2] | 10,900 | NA ^[2]
 | NA ^[2] | NA ^[2] | |
| | 240,375
1,443,741
203,413
1,682,585
62,698
894,943 | 2000 2025 240,375 292,070 1,443,741 1,714,200 203,413 233,200 1,682,585 2,064,200 62,698 86,200 894,943 1,096,200 | 2000 2025 Absolute Change 240,375 292,070 51,695 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 203,413 233,200 29,787 1,682,585 2,064,200 381,615 62,698 86,200 23,502 894,943 1,096,200 201,257 | 2000 2025 Absolute Change Percent Change 240,375 292,070 51,695 21.5% 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 1,682,585 2,064,200 381,615 22.7% 62,698 86,200 23,502 37.5% 894,943 1,096,200 201,257 22.5% | Population Population 2000 2025 Absolute Change Percent Change 2000 240,375 292,070 51,695 21.5% 72,677 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 523,366 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 68,237 1,682,585 2,064,200 381,615 22.7% 565,863 62,698 86,200 23,502 37.5% 17,132 894,943 1,096,200 201,257 22.5% 276,598 | Population House 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Change 2000 2025 240,375 292,070 51,695 21.5% 72,677 91,677 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 523,366 611,680 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 68,237 76,980 1,682,585 2,064,200 381,615 22.7% 565,863 695,170 62,698 86,200 23,502 37.5% 17,132 23,830 894,943 1,096,200 201,257 22.5% 276,598 344,110 | Population HouseHouse 2000 2025 Absolute Change 2000 2025 Absolute Change 240,375 292,070 51,695 21.5% 72,677 91,677 19,000 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 523,366 611,680 88,314 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 68,237 76,980 8,743 1,682,585 2,064,200 381,615 22.7% 565,863 695,170 129,307 62,698 86,200 23,502 37.5% 17,132 23,830 6,698 894,943 1,096,200 201,257 22.5% 276,598 344,110 67,512 | Population HouseHouse 2000 2025 Absolute Change Percent Change 240,375 292,070 51,695 21.5% 72,677 91,677 19,000 26.1% 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 523,366 611,680 88,314 16.9% 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 68,237 76,980 8,743 12.8% 1,682,585 2,064,200 381,615 22.7% 565,863 695,170 129,307 22.9% 62,698 86,200 23,502 37.5% 17,132 23,830 6,698 39.1% 894,943 1,096,200 201,257 22.5% 276,598 344,110 67,512 24.4% | Population Households Percent Change 2000 2025 Absolute Change Percent Change 2000 2017 19,000 26.1% 236,752 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 523,366 611,680 88,314 16.9% 751,680 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 68,237 76,980 8,743 12.8% 108,410 1,682,585 2,064,200 381,615 22.7% 565,863 695,170 129,307 22.9% 1,092,330 <tr< td=""><td>Population Households Percent Change 2000 2025 Absolute Change Percent Change 2000 2025 2000 2025 Absolute Change Percent Change 2000 2025 2000 2025 2000 2025 2000 2025 2000 2025 2000 2000 2025 2000<!--</td--><td>Population HouseHouse Image Percent Change Porcent Change Percent Change <th c<="" td=""><td>Population Employment (Jobs) 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Phange 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Percent Absolute
Change Percent
Percent 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Percent 240,375 292,070 51,695 21.5% 72,677 91,677 19,000 26.1% 236,752 314,830 78,078 33.0% 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 523,366 611,680 88,314 16.9% 751,680 1,014,190 262,510 34.9% 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 68,237 76,980 8,743 12.8% 108,410 146,520 38,110 35.2% 1,682,585 2,064,200 381,615 22.7% 565,863 695,170 129,307 22.9% 1,092,330 1,395,830 303,500 27.8% 62,698 86,200 23,502 37.5% 17,132 23,830 6,698 39.1% 50,280 69,540 19,260</td><td>Population Households Employment (Jobs) Age 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Pricent 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent 2000 2025 Absolute
Percent Percent 2000 2010 314,830 78,078 33.0% 60,138 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 523,366 611,680 88,314 16.9% 751,680 1,014,190 262,510 34.9% 392,243 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 68,237 76,980 8,743 12.8% 108,410 146,520 38,110 35.2% 56,960 1,682,585</td><td>Note that the interview is there inter</td><td>Population House-lds Employment (Jobs) Age (Youth) - 19 Yer 2000 2025 Absolute Change Percent 2000 2025 Absolute Change 2000 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170</td><td>Normalization in the constraint of the constrain</td><td>Note that the intervent of the interve</td><td>Note that the second s</td><td>Population Population Population Absolute Parcent Range Porcent Clobs Absolute Parcent Clobs Absolute Parcent Range Porcent Clobs Absolute Parcent Clobs</td></th></td></td></tr<> | Population Households Percent Change 2000 2025 Absolute Change Percent Change 2000 2025 2000 2025 Absolute Change Percent Change 2000 2025 2000 2025 2000 2025 2000 2025 2000 2025 2000 2000 2025 2000 </td <td>Population HouseHouse Image Percent Change Porcent Change Percent Change <th c<="" td=""><td>Population Employment (Jobs) 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Phange 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Percent Absolute
Change Percent
Percent 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Percent 240,375 292,070 51,695 21.5% 72,677 91,677 19,000 26.1% 236,752 314,830 78,078 33.0% 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 523,366 611,680 88,314 16.9% 751,680 1,014,190 262,510 34.9% 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 68,237 76,980 8,743 12.8% 108,410 146,520 38,110 35.2% 1,682,585 2,064,200 381,615 22.7% 565,863 695,170 129,307 22.9% 1,092,330 1,395,830 303,500 27.8% 62,698 86,200 23,502 37.5% 17,132 23,830 6,698 39.1% 50,280 69,540 19,260</td><td>Population Households Employment (Jobs) Age 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Pricent 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent 2000 2025 Absolute
Percent Percent 2000 2010 314,830 78,078 33.0% 60,138 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 523,366 611,680 88,314 16.9% 751,680 1,014,190 262,510 34.9% 392,243 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 68,237 76,980 8,743 12.8% 108,410 146,520 38,110 35.2% 56,960 1,682,585</td><td>Note that the interview is there inter</td><td>Population House-lds Employment (Jobs) Age (Youth) - 19 Yer 2000 2025 Absolute Change Percent 2000 2025 Absolute Change 2000 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170</td><td>Normalization in the constraint of the constrain</td><td>Note that the intervent of the interve</td><td>Note that the second s</td><td>Population Population Population Absolute Parcent Range Porcent Clobs Absolute Parcent Clobs Absolute Parcent Range Porcent Clobs Absolute Parcent Clobs</td></th></td> | Population HouseHouse Image Percent Change Porcent Change Percent Change <th c<="" td=""><td>Population Employment (Jobs) 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Phange 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Percent Absolute
Change Percent
Percent 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Percent 240,375 292,070 51,695 21.5% 72,677 91,677 19,000 26.1% 236,752 314,830 78,078 33.0% 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 523,366 611,680 88,314 16.9% 751,680 1,014,190 262,510 34.9% 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 68,237 76,980 8,743 12.8% 108,410 146,520 38,110 35.2% 1,682,585 2,064,200 381,615 22.7% 565,863 695,170 129,307 22.9% 1,092,330 1,395,830 303,500 27.8% 62,698 86,200 23,502 37.5% 17,132 23,830 6,698 39.1% 50,280 69,540 19,260</td><td>Population Households Employment (Jobs) Age 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Pricent 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent 2000 2025 Absolute
Percent Percent 2000 2010 314,830 78,078 33.0% 60,138 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 523,366 611,680 88,314 16.9% 751,680 1,014,190 262,510 34.9% 392,243 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 68,237 76,980 8,743 12.8% 108,410 146,520 38,110 35.2% 56,960 1,682,585</td><td>Note that the interview is there inter</td><td>Population House-lds Employment (Jobs) Age (Youth) - 19 Yer 2000 2025 Absolute Change Percent 2000 2025 Absolute Change 2000 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170</td><td>Normalization in the constraint of the constrain</td><td>Note that the intervent of the interve</td><td>Note that the second s</td><td>Population Population Population Absolute Parcent Range Porcent Clobs Absolute Parcent Clobs Absolute Parcent Range Porcent Clobs Absolute Parcent Clobs</td></th> | <td>Population Employment (Jobs) 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Phange 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Percent Absolute
Change Percent
Percent 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Percent 240,375 292,070 51,695 21.5% 72,677 91,677 19,000 26.1% 236,752 314,830 78,078 33.0% 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 523,366 611,680 88,314 16.9% 751,680 1,014,190 262,510 34.9% 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 68,237 76,980 8,743 12.8% 108,410 146,520 38,110 35.2% 1,682,585 2,064,200 381,615 22.7% 565,863 695,170 129,307 22.9% 1,092,330 1,395,830 303,500 27.8% 62,698 86,200 23,502 37.5% 17,132 23,830 6,698 39.1% 50,280 69,540 19,260</td> <td>Population Households Employment (Jobs) Age 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Pricent 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent 2000 2025 Absolute
Percent Percent 2000 2010 314,830 78,078 33.0% 60,138 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 523,366 611,680 88,314 16.9% 751,680 1,014,190 262,510 34.9% 392,243 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 68,237 76,980 8,743 12.8% 108,410 146,520 38,110 35.2% 56,960 1,682,585</td> <td>Note that the interview is there inter</td> <td>Population House-lds Employment (Jobs) Age (Youth) - 19 Yer 2000 2025 Absolute Change Percent 2000 2025 Absolute Change 2000 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170</td> <td>Normalization in the constraint of the constrain</td> <td>Note that the intervent of the interve</td> <td>Note that the second s</td> <td>Population Population Population Absolute Parcent Range Porcent Clobs Absolute Parcent Clobs Absolute Parcent Range Porcent Clobs Absolute Parcent Clobs</td> | Population Employment (Jobs) 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Phange 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Percent Absolute
Change Percent
Percent 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Percent 240,375 292,070 51,695 21.5% 72,677 91,677 19,000 26.1% 236,752 314,830 78,078 33.0% 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 523,366 611,680 88,314 16.9% 751,680 1,014,190 262,510 34.9% 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 68,237 76,980 8,743 12.8% 108,410 146,520 38,110 35.2% 1,682,585 2,064,200 381,615 22.7% 565,863 695,170 129,307 22.9% 1,092,330 1,395,830 303,500 27.8% 62,698 86,200 23,502 37.5% 17,132 23,830 6,698 39.1% 50,280 69,540 19,260 | Population Households Employment (Jobs) Age 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent
Pricent 2000 2025 Absolute
Change Percent 2000 2025 Absolute
Percent Percent 2000 2010 314,830 78,078 33.0% 60,138 1,443,741 1,714,200 270,459 18.7% 523,366 611,680 88,314 16.9% 751,680 1,014,190 262,510 34.9% 392,243 203,413 233,200 29,787 14.6% 68,237 76,980 8,743 12.8% 108,410 146,520 38,110 35.2% 56,960 1,682,585 | Note that the interview is there inter | Population House-lds Employment (Jobs) Age (Youth) - 19 Yer 2000 2025 Absolute Change Percent 2000 2025 Absolute Change 2000 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 20170 | Normalization in the constraint of the constrain | Note that the intervent of the interve | Note that the second s | Population Population Population Absolute Parcent Range Porcent Clobs Absolute Parcent Clobs Absolute Parcent Range Porcent Clobs Absolute Parcent Clobs |

^[1] The "Study Area" definition is the same as that used for the FTA "New Starts" process and covers an area approximately 1.5 to 2 miles wide from the BART Warm Springs Station to the proposed Santa Clara Station.

^[2] Age projections from ABAG are not available at the City level (Hing Wong at ABAG, Personal Communication, Sept. 2, 2003)

Source: ABAG Projections 2002, Forecasts for the San Francisco Bay Area to the Year 2025; Population, Housing, Job and Age Projections.

and employment in the corridor directly served by the BART Alternative. The MOS-1E scenario based on year 2025 projections would not directly serve approximately 17,400 people, 5,200 households, and 10,000 jobs within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of these two deferred stations.

4.15.2.2 Household Characteristics

A household, as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, is a group of people, related or not, living together in a dwelling unit. Table 4.15-2 compares household characteristics in the study area to those of Alameda and Santa Clara counties and the cities of Fremont, Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara.

Table 4.15-2: Household Characteristics (2000)								
	Number of Households	Average Household Size	Total Number of Families					
Total Study Area	72,677	3.04	48,763					
Alameda County	523,366	2.71	339,096					
City of Fremont	68,237	2.96	52,228					
Santa Clara County	565,863	2.92	597,329					
City of Milpitas	17,132	3.47	14,002					
City of San Jose	276,598	3.20	203,681					
City of Santa Clara	38,526	2.58	24,100					
Source: 2000 U.S. Census Da	ta.							

In 2000, there were 72,677 households in the study area, with an average household size of 3.04 persons. Sixty-seven percent were family households. The City of Fremont and Santa Clara County had very comparable average household sizes of 2.96 and 2.92, while Alameda County's average household size of 2.71 was lower and the average household size for the City of Milpitas and the City of San Jose, 3.47 and 3.20 persons, were both higher. The City of Santa Clara has the smallest average household size, 2.58 persons.

4.15.2.3 Ethnic Mix

An ethnicity profile of the study area population is derived from 2000 U.S. Census data. The racial categories used are White, Black or African American, Hispanic, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Some Other Race and Two or More Races.

As shown in Table 4.15-3, approximately 72 percent of study area residents are members of minority groups. This compares to a 59 percent minority population in Alameda County and the City of Fremont. In Santa Clara County, 56 percent of the population is represented by minorities, with 76 percent minority in the City of Milpitas, 64 percent in the City of San Jose, and 52 percent in the City of Santa Clara.

4.15.2.4 Income

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, as shown in Table 4.15-4, the average national poverty threshold for a family of four, including two children under the age of 18, is an annual income of \$16,895. The 2000 median household income for the study area census tract block groups ranged from \$60,531 to \$118,486, and 10 percent of area households were below poverty level. Alameda County, with a median

	Table	4.15-3:	Ethnic Comp	osition in	the Study Are	a (2000)		
	Total Pop	ulation	White	% of Total	Black or African American	% of Total	Hispanic	% of Total
Study Area	240,375		68,625	28%	7,118	3%	78,252	33%
Alameda County	1,443,	741	591,095	41%	211,124	15%	273,910	19%
City of Fremont	203,4	13	84,149	41%	6,084	3%	27,409	13%
Santa Clara County	1,682,585		744,282	44%	44,475	3%	403,401	24%
City of Milpitas	62,698		14,917	24%	2,187	4%	10,417	17%
City of San Jose	894,943		322,534	36%	29,495	3%	269,989	30%
City of Santa Clara	102,361		49,392	48%	2,237	2%	16,364	16%
	Asian	% of Total	Native HI/ Other Pacific Islander	% of Total	American Indian/AK Native	% of Total	Two or More Races/Some Other Race (Alone)	% of Total
Study Area	Asian 74,496		Other Pacific		Indian/AK		Races/Some Other Race	
Study Area Alameda County		Total	Other Pacific Islander	Total	Indian/AK Native	Total	Races/Some Other Race (Alone)	Total
3	74,496	Total	Other Pacific Islander 996	Total 0.4%	Indian/AK Native	Total 0.5%	Races/Some Other Race (Alone) 7,755	Total
Alameda County	74,496	Total 32% 20%	Other Pacific Islander 996 8,458	Total 0.4% 0.5%	Indian/AK Native 1,135 5,306	Total 0.5% 0.5%	Races/Some Other Race (Alone) 7,755 61,175	Total 3% 4%
Alameda County City of Fremont	74,496 292,673 74,773	Total 32% 20% 37%	Other Pacific Islander 996 8,458 736	Total 0.4% 0.5% 0.25%	Indian/AK Native 1,135 5,306 656	Total 0.5% 0.5% 0.5%	Races/Some Other Race (Alone) 7,755 61,175 9,606	Total 3% 4% 4%
Alameda County City of Fremont Santa Clara County	74,496 292,673 74,773 426,771	Total 32% 20% 37% 25%	Other Pacific Islander 996 8,458 736 5,040	Total 0.4% 0.5% 0.25% 0.25%	Indian/AK Native 1,135 5,306 656 5,270	Total 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5%	Races/Some Other Race (Alone) 7,755 61,175 9,606 53,346	Total 3% 4% 3%

Table 4.15-4: Household Income and Poverty Status (2000)								
	Median Household Income	Households Below Poverty Level	Percent Below Poverty Level					
Total Study Area	\$60,531 - \$118,486	7,031	10%					
Alameda County	\$55,946	51,410	10%					
City of Fremont	\$76,579	3,049	4%					
Santa Clara County	\$74,335	34,535	6%					
City of Milpitas	\$84,429	655	4%					
City of San Jose	\$70,243	19,737	7%					
City of Santa Clara	\$69,466	2,543	7%					
Source: 2000 U.S. Census L	Data.							

household income of \$55,946, had the same percentage of households below poverty level as the study area. In contrast, the proportion of households in poverty in the City of Fremont was lower, at 4 percent, and the median household income at \$76,579, was higher. In Santa Clara County and the cities of Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara, the proportion of households living in poverty was also lower than the study area, ranging from 4 to 7 percent, and the respective median household incomes of \$74,335, \$84,429, \$70,243, and \$69,466 were higher.

4.15.2.5 Occupied Housing Units Without Private Transportation

Occupied housing units without private transportation are included in the definition of transit-dependent populations. The individuals in these housing units rely on public transportation services for access to employment opportunities, school, social/recreational functions, medical appointments, and mobility in general. Table 4.15-5 shows the representation of housing units without private transportation in the study area based on 2000 U.S. Census data. Approximately 10 percent of the housing units in the study area are without private transport. In contrast to Alameda County (where 11 percent of housing units are without private transport), residents of Santa Clara County and the cities of Fremont, Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara are significantly less transit-dependent as defined by the availability of private transportation (having only 5 to 6 percent of housing units that are without private transport).

Table 4.15-5: Housing Units Availability of Private Transportation (2000)								
	Total Housing Units (occupied)	Housing Units Without Private Transport	% of Housing Units Without Private Transport					
Total Study Area	69,980	6,730	10%					
Alameda County	523,366	57,287	11%					
City of Fremont	68,237	3,109	5%					
Santa Clara County	565,863	31,978	6%					
City of Milpitas	17,132	850	5%					
City of San Jose	276,598	16,885	6%					
City of Santa Clara	38,526	2,360	6%					
Source: 2000 U.S. Census D	ata.							

4.15.2.6 Jobs and Employment

Total jobs by sector in the study area, as shown on Table 4.15-6, are based on ABAG's Forecasts for the San Francisco Bay Area to the Year 2025. In 2000, there were approximately 236,752 jobs in the study area. Thirty-five percent of the jobs were manufacturing and wholesale; 34 percent service; 10 percent retail; 19 percent other; and less than 0.5 percent agriculture and mining. ABAG projects the total number of jobs in the study area to increase by 33 percent between 2000 and 2025. According to ABAG, the percentages of service jobs will increase to 39% and there will be a slight decrease in the percentages of jobs in the manufacturing and wholesale (32%), retail (9%), and agriculture and mining (0.4%) job sectors. Other jobs will remain the same at 19%.

The services industry is Alameda County's largest economic sector, followed by government, manufacturing, and retail trade. Alameda County jobs are expected to increase 35 percent by 2025, with

		Tabl	e 4.15-6: Jo	bs by Sec	tor (2000)-2025)						
Total						Agriculture and Mining						
Study Area Census Tracts	2000	2025	Absolute Change	% Change	2025 % of Total	2000	2025	Absolute Change	% Change	2025 % of Total		
Total Study Area [1]	236,752	314,830	78,078	33%	100%	1,260	1,168	(92)	-7%	0.4%		
Alameda County	751,680	1,014,190	262,510	35%	100%	3,460	3,450	(10)	-0.3%	0.3%		
City of Fremont	108,410	146,520	38,110	35%	100%	840	840		0%	0.6%		
Santa Clara County	1,092,330	1,395,830	303,500	28%	100%	6,780	6,450	(330)	-5%	0.5%		
City of Milpitas	50,280	69,540	19,260	38%	100%	190	180	(10)	-5%	0.3%		
City of San Jose	442,670	574,440	131,770	30%	100%	2,070	2,020	(50)	-2%	0.4%		
City of Santa Clara	135,960	170,260	34,300	25%	100%	260	260		0%	0.2%		
		Manufacturing and Wholesale						Retail				
Total Study Area [1]	81,934	101,271	19,337	24%	32%	24,365	28,234	3,869	16%	9%		
Alameda County	163,290	212,920	49,630	30%	21%	120,590	153,280	32,690	27%	15%		
City of Fremont	35,210	47,460	12,250	35%	32%	16,100	20,470	4,370	27%	14%		
Santa Clara County	331,880	420,910	89,030	27%	30%	147,590	179,980	32,390	22%	13%		
City of Milpitas	22,350	29,600	7,250	32%	43%	5,250	6,910	1,660	32%	10%		
City of San Jose	101,260	130,330	29,070	29%	23%	66,280	78,800	12,520	19%	14%		
City of Santa Clara	57,900	72,410	14,510	25%	43%	14,420	18,140	3,720	26%	11%		
		S	Service			Other						
Total Study Area [1]	79,498	122,793	43,295	54%	39%	49,695	60,546	10,851	22%	19%		
Alameda County	268,770	386,320	117,550	44%	38%	195,570	258,220	62,650	32%	25%		
City of Fremont	34,230	50,630	16,400	48%	35%	22,030	27,120	5,090	23%	19%		
Santa Clara County	422,980	534,670	111,690	26%	38%	183,100	253,820	70,720	39%	18%		
City of Milpitas	12,180	16,240	4,060	33%	23%	10,310	16,610	6,300	61%	24%		
City of San Jose	179,820	231,630	51,810	29%	40%	93,240	131,660	38,420	41%	23%		
City of Santa Clara	48,080	60,880	12,800	27%	36%	15,300	18,570	3,270	21%	11%		

Note:

^[1] 2025 Projections by census block groups are not available. Census tract data were used for study area projections. Source: ABAG Projections 2002, Forecasts for the San Francisco Bay Area to the Year 2025; Population, Housing, Job and Age Projections.

approximately 38 percent service; 26 percent other; 21 percent manufacturing and wholesale; 15 percent retail; and less than 0.5 percent agriculture and mining. The Port of Oakland, with one of the nation's major containerized shipping facilities, has helped make Alameda County an important transportation center.

The City of Fremont's principal businesses are in the commercial and industrial sectors, including the New United Motor Manufacturing (NUMMI) plant, a joint venture of General Motors and Toyota. As part of Silicon Valley, Fremont is also home to a large technology sector. Total jobs in the City of Fremont are expected to increase 35 percent between 2000 and 2025, from 108,410 to 146,520, with approximately 35 percent service, 32 percent manufacturing and wholesale, 19 percent other, 14 percent retail, and less than 0.5 percent agriculture and mining.

Santa Clara County is a major employment center for the region, providing more than a quarter of all jobs in the Bay Area. In 2000, the services, manufacturing, and retail trade sectors combined accounted for 74 percent of jobs in the County. Other important sectors are construction and mining, wholesale trade, transportation, public utilities, and government. Jobs in Santa Clara County are expected to increase 28 percent by 2025, with approximately 39 percent service, 30 percent manufacturing and wholesale, 18 percent other, 13 percent retail, and less than 0.5 percent agriculture and mining.

The City of Milpitas is home to a broad range of small and large businesses and industries and is a vital component of the high-tech Silicon Valley. Total jobs in the City of Milpitas are expected to increase 38 percent by 2025. With the expected increase in jobs, approximately 43 percent will be manufacturing and wholesale, 24 percent other, 23 percent service, 10 percent retail, and less than 0.5 percent agriculture and mining.

The City of San Jose has an extremely concentrated high-tech industry and is now home to over 11,400 high-tech companies employing over 250,000 people. Most notable are the company headquarters of Cisco Systems, Inc., eBay, Adobe Systems, Inc., AboveNet, Inc., and Secure Computing Corporation. High-tech companies in downtown San Jose include Internet service providers such as Earthlink. Total jobs in San Jose are expected to increase 30 percent from 2000 to 2025, with approximately 40 percent service, 23 percent other and manufacturing and wholesale, 14 percent retail, and less than 0.5 percent agriculture and mining.

The City of Santa Clara's employment base includes 135,960 jobs primarily in the manufacturing, wholesale, and service sectors. An increase of 25 percent, or 34,300 total jobs, is expected by 2025, with approximately 43 percent manufacturing and wholesale, 36 percent service, 11 percent other, 10 percent retail, and less than 0.5 percent agriculture and mining.

4.15.2.7 Labor Force Characteristics

Based on 2000 U.S. Census information, an estimated 115,691 persons, age 16 and older, are in the labor force in the study area. Of this total, 110,282 persons are employed and approximately 5 percent 5,409 are unemployed. The labor force as defined here includes individuals who reside in the study area but may or may not commute to jobs elsewhere. Manufacturing occupations represent 29 percent of the labor force, followed by educational, professional, and public administration occupations representing 28 percent of the labor force. Retail trade, arts and entertainment, and other service occupations represent 19 percent of the labor force while construction, transportation, finance, wholesale trade, and agriculture represent 16 percent.

Unemployment rates in Alameda County and the City of Fremont are 6 percent and 4 percent, respectively. The County of Santa Clara and the cities of Fremont, Milpitas, and San Jose have a 4 percent unemployment rate and the City of Santa Clara has 3 percent unemployment. The labor force by occupation for the study area is shown on Table 4.15-7.

	Table 4.15-7: La	abor Force by Occupat	ion (2000)			
	Total Labor Force	Employed Labor	Force Unemple	oyed Labor Force		
Total Study Area	115,691	110,282		5,409		
Alameda County	733,194	692,833		40,361		
City of Fremont	106,368	102,187		4,181		
Santa Clara County	878,106	843,912		34,194		
City of Milpitas	31,480	30,302		1,178		
City of San Jose	456,442	436,890		19,552		
City of Santa Clara	57,472	55,528		1,944		
		Industry				
	Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting, and Mining	Construction	Manufacturing	Wholesale Trade		
Total Study Area	603	5,897	33,385	3,497		
Alameda County	1,741	38,919	98,523	28,368		
City of Fremont	163	4,168	27,446	4,539		
Santa Clara County	4,364	42,232	231,784	25,515		
City of Milpitas	183	1,073	12,482	978		
City of San Jose	1,552	25,190	122,913	14,016		
City of Santa Clara	52	1,967	17,120	1,608		
	Retail Trade	Transportation, Warehousing and Utilities	Professional	Finance, Insurance and Real Estate		
Total Study Area	10,276	4,097	15,025	4,139		
Alameda County	74,749	40,129	102,423	46,876		
City of Fremont	11,526	4,234	15,575	5,902		
Santa Clara County	83,369	23,546	131,015	38,715		
City of Milpitas	2,501	987	3,310	1,151		
				19,532		
City of San Jose	45,941	14,523	59,179	19,532		
• •	45,941 5,261	14,523 1,553	59,179 9,421	19,532 2,248		
City of San Jose						
City of San Jose	5,261 Educational, Health, and Social	1,553 Entertainment, Arts, Recreation, Accommodation	9,421 Public	2,248		
City of San Jose City of Santa Clara	5,261 Educational, Health, and Social Services	1,553 Entertainment, Arts, Recreation, Accommodation and Food Service	9,421 Public Administration	2,248 Other Services		
City of San Jose City of Santa Clara Total Study Area	5,261 Educational, Health, and Social Services 14,072	1,553 Entertainment, Arts, Recreation, Accommodation and Food Service 7,769	9,421 Public Administration 2,772	2,248 Other Services 4,067		
City of San Jose City of Santa Clara Total Study Area Alameda County	5,261Educational, Health, and Social Services14,072126,941	1,553Entertainment, Arts, Recreation, Accommodation and Food Service7,76944,084	9,421 Public Administration 2,772 25,603	2,248 Other Services 4,067 64,477		
City of San Jose City of Santa Clara Total Study Area Alameda County City of Fremont	5,261Educational, Health, and Social Services14,072126,94113,501	1,553Entertainment, Arts, Recreation, Accommodation and Food Service7,76944,0844,610	9,421 Public Administration 2,772 25,603 2,516	2,248 Other Services 4,067 64,477 8,007		
City of San Jose City of Santa Clara Total Study Area Alameda County City of Fremont Santa Clara County	5,261Educational, Health, and Social Services14,072126,94113,501123,890	1,553Entertainment, Arts, Recreation, Accommodation and Food Service7,76944,0844,61049,186	9,421 Public Administration 2,772 25,603 2,516 21,211	2,248 Other Services 4,067 64,477 8,007 69,085		
City of San Jose City of Santa Clara Total Study Area Alameda County City of Fremont Santa Clara County City of Milpitas	5,261 Educational, Health, and Social Services 14,072 126,941 13,501 123,890 3,054	1,553Entertainment, Arts, Recreation, Accommodation and Food Service7,76944,0844,61049,1861,621	9,421 Public Administration 2,772 25,603 2,516 21,211 609	2,248 Other Services 4,067 64,477 8,007 69,085 2,353		

4.15.3 IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION MEASURES

4.15.3.1 Impacts

Population, Housing, and Employment

The population, housing, and employment projections for the SVRTC study area are based on ABAG 2025 projections. Those projections are based on the general plan documents for the cities of Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara. Those general plans include the BART Alternative.

No Action and Baseline Alternatives

The general plans of the cities of Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara include support for the BART extension with provisions of higher densities around the proposed stations and along the corridor. Without implementation of the BART Alternative, however, the No-Action and Baseline alternatives would result in a more gradual build out of the general plans, as more intense land uses (e.g., higher densities and mixed-use development) would not likely occur around BART station areas at the same rate. Therefore, while the projections of population, housing, and jobs may not change significantly, the timing of such projections would likely be extended with implementation of the No-Action and Baseline alternatives in comparison to the BART Alternative.

BART Alternative

The BART Alternative would provide improved transportation service to people living and working in the SVRTC consistent with local jurisdiction general plans. As such, the BART Alternative would be consistent with the ABAG 2025 projections for population, housing, and employment.

Residential and Non-Residential Relocation and Tunnel Easement Impacts

The SVRTC alternatives would require property acquisitions and resultant relocations affecting residential and non-residential properties. The types of relocations associated with the alternatives are described below, along with an estimate of the relative magnitude of each. Relocations would be the result of acquiring the underlying property in whole or in part to accommodate the alternatives.

This estimate of relocations is based on property utilization in the fall and winter of 2002/2003. The actual numbers and types of relocations could change prior to project implementation. For purposes of presenting a conservative analysis, properties or easements are assumed to be acquired permanently. During final engineering, VTA may determine that some parcels can be leased during construction, avoiding permanent displacement impacts. Also, the number of property acquisitions and related relocations and easements required could change during final design and engineering, as could the amount of land required from individual parcels. Estimates presented here are based on the Plan and Profile Drawings in Appendix A and the Station Concepts in Appendix B.

Mitigation for relocation effects, in the form of relocation assistance and payments, is also discussed. Federal and state laws require consistent and fair treatment of owners of property to be acquired, including just compensation for their property. These laws also require uniform and equitable treatment of displaced persons or businesses.

No-Action Alternative

Projects planned under the No-Action Alternative would undergo separate environmental review to define any residential and non-residential relocation. (See Section 3.2.1.2 for a list of future projects under the No-Action Alternative.)

Baseline Alternative

The Baseline Alternative would require property acquisitions to accommodate the two busway connectors that would facilitate bus circulation from 1-680 and I-880 into and out of the proposed BART Warm Springs Station area, and a third connector between I-880 and Montague Expressway to facilitate San Jose and Santa Clara trips.

The connectors from the BART Warm Springs Station to I-880 and I-680 (Figure 3.3-3) require the relocation of 1 industrial and 1 retail business. The remainder of the property that would be acquired for the I-680 and I-880 connectors is vacant industrial land located along the southern edge of South Grimmer Boulevard and the eastern edge of Fremont Boulevard. One parcel (some of which is grassland) located on Warm Springs Boulevard west of the railroad tracks would require partial acquisition to accommodate the column supports for the busway connector ramps. The area to be acquired would be minimal; therefore, the acquisition would not be an adverse impact. Additionally, across Old Warm Springs Boulevard, the existing industrial parcel owned by General Motors Corporation would require partial acquisition of existing vacant industrial land. The remaining portions of the I-680 and I-880 busway connectors occur along city and Caltrans ROW and would affect vacant industrial land adjacent to the NUMMI plant along Fremont Boulevard, as well as portions of I-680 and I-880.

The connector between I-880 and Montague Expressway (Figure 3.3-4) would require the relocation of 1 sign and additional ROW affecting the landscaping and parking areas of several industrial, hotel, and restaurant businesses.

BART Alternative

The BART Alternative and MOS scenarios would require residential and non-residential relocations as a result of the acquisition of property to construct each station area, as well as to accommodate a variety of support structures and facilities required for operation of the line. Depending on the alignment and station options selected, approximately 46 to 101 businesses and 1 to 5 residential units would require relocation due to construction of the BART Alternative. In addition, up to 400 flea market vendor stalls, 1,025 rental storage tenants, 2 advertising signs, and 1 utility facility would require relocation. This information is summarized in Table 4.15-8.

The businesses that would be displaced are primarily industrial and manufacturing uses and are not localserving businesses whose success is dependent on a specific location. Exceptions to this include the following locations:

- Civic Plaza/SJSU and Market Street stations, where possible relocation of several offices, small retail shops, and restaurants may occur to accommodate station entrance options.
- Maintenance Facility along Coleman Avenue, where several small shops would be displaced.
- Berryessa Station, where up to 400 vendor stalls of the San Jose Flea Market would be displaced under either the Northeast or Southwest Parking Structure Option. However, this displacement could be deferred under MOS-1E.

Relocations associated with the BART Alternative and MOS scenarios are discussed below by jurisdiction. Other properties to be acquired for the BART Alternative do not impact existing structures or involve relocations.

<u>City of Fremont</u>

Within the City of Fremont, the BART Alternative and the MOS scenarios would require acquisition of property and related relocation for the following uses:

	Desidential		Business I	Relocation	IS	Advertising		Flea	
	Residential Relocations	Light Industrial	Retail	Office	Restaurant	Sign Relocations	Storage Tenants	Market Vendors ^[2]	Utility Facilities
East of Rail Right-of-Way Option	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rail Right-of-Way Option	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Warren Avenue to Dixon Landing Road	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dixon Landing Alignment - All Options	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South of Dixon Landing Rd. to Calaveras Blvd.	0	1	0	0	0	0	75	0	0
South Calaveras Future Station (All Options)	0	2	0	10	0	0	0	0	0
Between Calaveras Blvd. and Montague Expy. (Locomotive Wye - Milpitas Option)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montague/Capitol Station	1	11	0	2	0	0	875	0	0
Between Montague/Capitol Station to Berryessa Station	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berryessa Station - Parking Structure Northeast	0	11	0	0	3-5	0	0	400+/-	0
Berryessa Station - Parking Structure Southwest	0	2	0	0	3-5	0	0	400+/-	0
Alum Rock Station–US 101/Diagonal Option	0	7	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
Alum Rock Station-Railroad/28th St. Option	0	9	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
Civic Plaza/SJSU and Market Street Stations	0-4	0	0-5	0-2	0-3	0	0	0	0
Diridon/Arena Alignment and Station North Option	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Diridon/Arena Alignment and Station South Option	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Santa Clara - Maintenance Facility	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Santa Clara Station - Parking Structure North	0	1	0-3	0	0-2	0	0	0	0
Santa Clara Station - Parking Structure South	0	2	0-3	0	0-2	0	0	0	0
Tail Track - De La Cruz Blvd to Lafayette St	0	10	0	0	0	0	75	0	0
Range of Total Potential Impacts [1]	1-5	40-68	0-8	3-15	3-10	2	1,025	400+/-	1

Notes:

^[1] Numbers reflect the number of potentially affected occupants. The ranges reflect the lowest and highest potential numbers based on the combination of various alternatives and options. ^[2] A total of 384 occupied vendor stalls was counted February 22, 2003. The number of occupied vendor stalls varies from day to day and seasonally. Therefore, it is represented as 400+/vendor stalls.

Rail Corridor

Construction of the BART rail line would take place primarily within the railroad property recently purchased by VTA (December 2002). Two options are proposed for the BART rail line within the City of Fremont: the Rail Right-of-Way Option and East of Rail Right-of-Way Option.

The Rail Right-of-Way and the East of Rail Right-of-Way options both require the relocation of a rail-truck tank car transfer facility located just south of East Warren Avenue (Figure A-5). The facility would be relocated to an area west of Old Warm Springs Boulevard (Figure A-4). The relocation of the rail-truck tank car transfer facility would not require the displacement of any residence or business. However, construction of the new facility and a rail spur to serve it would require partial acquisition of ROW along a former agricultural property that is currently fallow. This property is located in an urbanized area that is zoned by the City of Fremont as General Industrial. Since the city has planned for the conversion of this property to an industrial use, the acquisition would not be an adverse impact.

The Rail Right-of-Way Option does not require any additional relocation. The East of Rail Right-of-Way Option would require the relocation of 13 additional light industrial properties along the east side of the railroad corridor (Figure A-6).

The majority of UPRR track replaced by the BART Alternative can be accommodated within the railroad ROW. UPRR has identified the need for a freight railroad wye track and has recommended two optional locations for its placement (Locomotive Wye Fremont Option and Milpitas Option). The Locomotive Wye Fremont Option (Figure A-9, STA 117+00) would require the partial acquisition of an industrial property along Kato Road. The portion of the property to be affected is currently vacant; therefore, the acquisition would not affect existing uses. Freight access would also need to be severed in three locations on the property, although those freight access rail lines are not currently used. The Locomotive Wye Milpitas Option is discussed below under the City of Milpitas.

Support Facilities

Impacts due to the construction of support facilities are described below.

- **TPSS #1:** Construction of this traction power substation would occupy the site of the old tank transfer facility to be relocated to the site north of Grimmer Boulevard. The site would be acquired as a result of the old tank transfer facility relocation and reused for this substation. (Figures A-5 and A-6, STA 79+00)
- **TPSS #2:** Construction of this traction power substation would require the displacement of approximately 40 parking spaces from an existing industrial property located on Warm Springs Boulevard. No structure would be displaced, and the existing use could continue on the remainder of the property. The removal of the parking spaces could affect the property's conformance with the zoning code and might require approval of a variance. (Figure A-13, STA 174+00)
- Kato Road Grade Separation: The grade separation of Kato Road would affect access to two commercial parking lots. One lot is located west of the rail line on Kato Road, and the other is east on Kato Road. Each property has two access drives, so access would not be completely severed. One driveway would be relocated, providing two driveways to that property. The other property would have one driveway access only. (Figure A-11, STA 167+00, and Figure A-12)

City of Milpitas

Within the City of Milpitas, the BART Alternative and MOS scenarios would require acquisition of property and related relocation for the following uses:

Rail Corridor

The BART tracks would be accommodated generally within the railroad ROW. The need for additional ROW would result in the acquisition of a portion of a recreational vehicle (RV) storage area located south of Abel Street (Figure A-17, STA 254+00), 1 storage business, 75 storage units (Figure A-18, STA 268+00), and some parking from an adjacent industrial use. Property at this location would be acquired for replacement tracks as well as a bulk substation and traction power station. Approximately 70 vehicle storage spaces and an access easement would be acquired. The vehicle storage use may be able to continue on the remainder of the property. The storage business and 75 storage units would require relocation. No residential structures would be displaced.

Station Areas

Impacts due to construction of station areas are described below.

- South Calaveras Future Station: The South Calaveras Future Station would be located within the existing UPRR Milpitas Yard just south of SR 237 (Calaveras Boulevard). Support facilities include parking and car/bus drop-off areas in three optional arrangements, all of which would require relocation of 10 office and 2 light industrial businesses to the east. (Figure A-18 and Figure B-1)
- Montague/Capitol Station: The Montague/Capitol Station would be located in an existing light industrial area. The parking and car/bus drop-off areas for the station would require relocation of 11 light industrial businesses and 2 office uses. An 875-unit self-storage facility, including a manager's residential unit located to the east and west of the station, would also be displaced. (Figure A-20 and Figure B-8)

Support Facilities

Impacts due to construction of support facilities are described below.

- TPSS #3, Bulk Substation/Switching Station #1, Gap Breaker Station #1, Train Control Building, and the UPRR Milpitas Yard Lead Replacement and Replacement Tracks: As described under "Rail Corridor" above, the proposed location of these facilities would require the partial relocation of an RV storage area located on Railroad Court. The storage area would lose approximately half of its capacity (70 parking spaces), although the existing use could continue on the remainder of the property. The removal of the parking spaces on the adjacent industrial parcel could affect the property's conformance with the zoning code and may require approval of a variance. (Figure A-18, STA 260+00)
- **TPSS #4:** The site of this proposed traction power substation is vacant industrial land and would not require residential or business relocation. (Figure A-20, STA 366+00, and Figure A-21)
- Freight Railroad Wye: Construction of the Locomotive Wye Milpitas Option would require the relocation of an industrial building, parking spaces, storage areas, landscaping, and vacant land. The acquisition would occur on and between two large industrial properties along Gibraltar Drive, and could affect roadway access. The acquisition of the industrial building would discontinue its existing use; however, the building is part of a larger industrial complex that could continue to operate on the site. (Figure A-20, STA 355+00, and Figure A-21)
- UPRR Milpitas Yard: A new 20-foot ROW would be acquired to accommodate replacement tracks for the UPRR Milpitas Yard. The acquisition would affect properties along the east and west sides of the UPRR property. The acquisition west of the rail line on Curtis Avenue and Great Mall Drive would affect landscaping and storage areas, as well as parkland dedicated to the City of Milpitas (see Chapter 7, *Final Section 4(f) Evaluation*). Removal of parking spaces from the Great Mall

parking lot would also be required for a replacement drainage detention basin and a refuse storage area for the Parc Metropolitan Condominiums. The acquisition on the east side of the ROW would also affect landscaping and parking, although it is not anticipated to affect business operations. (Figures A-20 and A-21)

City of San Jose

Within the City of San Jose, the BART Alternative and MOS scenarios would require acquisition of property and related relocation for the following uses.

Rail Corridor

Within the City of San Jose, the rail line transitions from its alignment aboveground to an underground alignment beneath Santa Clara Street. The rail line would be accommodated within the railroad ROW for the aboveground portion. No relocation would be required for the underground portion of the alignment, although tunnel easements would be acquired from all properties the rail line would pass beneath. Tunnel easements would be required as follows:

- Alum Rock Alignment and Station US 101/Diagonal Option 20 nonresidential properties. (Figures A-26, A-27, and A-28)
- Alum Rock Alignment and Station Railroad/28th Street Option 44 residential and 21 nonresidential properties. (Figures A-30, A-31, and A-32)
- Diridon/Arena Alignment and Station North Option 16 residential and 33 nonresidential. (Figures A-36 and A-37)
- Diridon/Arena Alignment and Station South Option 14 residential and 39 nonresidential. (Figures A-38, A-39, and A-40)

These numbers are approximate and do not include acquisition of publicly owned road ROW or VTAowned property. Residential property may consist of single- or multi-family buildings. A single property may consist of one or more assessor parcels.

Station Areas

Impacts due to construction of station areas are described below.

• Berryessa Station: There are two parking structure options under consideration for the Berryessa Station. The Parking Structure Northeast Option would require the relocation of 11 light industrial businesses, up to 400 vendor stalls, and 3 to 5 restaurants within the San Jose Flea Market, and the partial acquisition of the south parking lot of the flea market. (Figure B-18)

The Parking Structure Southwest Option would require relocation of 2 light industrial businesses, up to 400 vendor stalls, and 3 to 5 restaurants within the San Jose Flea Market, and the full acquisition of the south parking lot of the flea market. (Figure B-20)

Under MOS-1E, the construction of the Berryessa Station would be deferred for three years. Therefore, under the Parking Structure Northeast Option, displacement of 11 light industrial businesses, 3 to 5 restaurants at the San Jose Flea Market, and up to 400 flea market stalls would be temporarily deferred as well. Under the Parking Structure Southwest Option, displacement of the same restaurants and flea market stalls would be deferred, as well as 2 light industrial businesses.

• Alum Rock Station: There are two alignment options for the Alum Rock Station: the US 101/Diagonal Option and the Railroad/28th Street Option, both of which would be located

underground and would require no property acquisitions, although tunnel easements would be acquired from all properties the rail line would pass beneath. The station parking structure and car/bus drop-off areas for the US 101/Diagonal Option would require relocation of 7 light industrial businesses, 1 office, and 2 advertising signs (Figure B-23). The station parking structure and car/bus drop-off areas for the Railroad/28th Street Option would require the relocation of 9 light industrial businesses, 1 office, and 2 advertising signs (Figure B-25).

• Civic Plaza/SJSU and Market Street Stations: The Civic Plaza/SJSU Station and Market Street stations would be located underground and would require no business or residential relocations, although tunnel easements would be acquired from all properties the rail line would pass beneath. The Civic Plaza/SJSU and Market Street stations would not provide parking.

These stations would require the development of station entrances from street level to the underground station. Approximately 12 optional station entrance locations have been identified for these two stations on public ROW and private property (Figures A-33, A-34, and A-35 and Figures B-28 and B-31). The majority of station entrances would affect vacant areas, commercial parking lots, sidewalks, and landscaping. Depending on the optional entrances selected, up to 4 residential units, 5 retail businesses, 2 office uses, and 3 restaurants could require relocation. Relocation to accommodate station entrances is anticipated to be less than the highest numbers shown since not all 12 optional locations would be selected. In addition, it may be possible to integrate station entrances into existing buildings without requiring business or residential relocation.

• Diridon/Arena Station: The Diridon/Arena Station would operate as a major intermodal connection point between Caltrain, VTA's LRT, and BART. The Diridon/Arena Alignment North Option would require no business relocation. The Diridon/Arena Alignment South Option would require the relocation of 1 industrial business. Two alternate parking structures and bus transfer areas are under consideration at this station both of which would require relocation of 2 light industrial businesses and 1 utility facility. (Figures B-33 and B-36).

Support Facilities

Impacts due to construction of support facilities for the BART Alternative and MOS scenarios are described below.

- Bulk Substation/Switching Station #2: Vacant industrial land would be acquired for the location of this facility, which would not cause the displacement of any business or residence. (Figure A-25, STA 547+00)
- **TPSS #5:** Vacant industrial land would be acquired for this traction power substation. No businesses or residences would require relocation. (Figure A-22, STA 415+00)
- **TPSS #6:** Two optional sites are contemplated for this traction power substation. One location is immediately south of Aschauer Court (Figure A-24, STA 509+00); the other is immediately north of Berryessa Road (Figure A-25, STA 518+00). Both sites are used for truck trailer storage. While a portion of the storage area on each site would be unavailable, the businesses would be able to continue operations. An access easement would be required.
- **TPSS #7:** There are two optional sites for this traction power substation: at the southwest end of the station for the US 101/Diagonal Option (Figure A-27, STA 606+00) and the north end of the station for the Railroad/28th Street Option (Figure A-30, STA 598+00). No businesses or residences would require relocation.
- **TPSS #8:** This traction power substation would be located at the west end of the underground Civic Plaza/SJSU Station. No businesses or residences would require relocation. (Figure A-34, STA 686+00)

- **TPSS #9:** There are two options for the placement of this traction power substation for the Diridon/Arena Station options: At the west end of the North Option (Figure A-36, STA 740+00), and at the east end of the South Option (Figure A-39, STA 735+00). No businesses or residences would require relocation.
- Laydown Staging Areas: The BART Alternative would require space for laydown and storage of construction materials and equipment throughout the construction period. The following are the proposed contractor work areas for the construction phase of the project:
 - Six acres south of East Warren Avenue and adjacent to the east side of the rail corridor. A portion of this site is to be acquired for the relocation of the tank transfer facility. Relocation impacts are discussed there. The remainder of the site, not included in the tank transfer facility acquisition/relocation, is vacant land. (Figure A-5, STA 77+00)
 - Two acres between Railroad Court and the rail corridor north of Calaveras Boulevard. This site is being acquired to accommodate TPSS #3 and a variety of other support facilities as discussed earlier in this section. (Figure A-18, STA 266+00)
 - Four acres adjoining the rail corridor south of Calaveras Boulevard. This staging area occupies a portion of the site for the South Calaveras Future Station. The staging area would only use the vacant portion of the site immediately adjacent to the railroad. No relocation would be required. (Figure A-18, STA 293+00)
 - Eighteen acres on either side of rail ROW south of Montague Expressway. This staging area occupies a portion of the Montague/Capitol Station site. Relocation requirements were discussed earlier in this section under the Montague/Capitol Station. (Figure A-20, STA 375+00)
 - Seventeen acres on either side of rail ROW north of Mabury Road. This staging area occupies a
 portion of the Berryessa Station Site. Relocation requirements were discussed earlier in this
 section under the Berryessa Station. (Figure A-25)
 - Nineteen acres to the west of US 101 south of East Julian Street. This staging area occupies the Alum Rock Station site. Relocation requirements were discussed earlier in this section under the Alum Rock Station. (Figure A-27, STA 600+00)
 - Two acres on northeast quadrant of 4th and East Santa Clara streets. This staging area includes area for an optional station entrance location for Civic Center/SJSU Station. This staging area would affect commercial property along the north side of East Santa Clara Street between 4th Street and 5th Street. Several of the improvements on this site have been demolished, and the remaining improvements are scheduled for demolition by the City of San Jose in preparation for redevelopment. VTA will work with the city to coordinate the timing of future construction activities. (Figure A-33, STA 687+00)
 - Two sites on the southwest and northeast quadrants of the East Santa Clara and Market Street intersection comprised of 0.72 acre. These sites are optional station entrance locations for Market Street Station. The site in the northeast quadrant of the intersection is paved parking area. The site in the southwest quadrant is occupied by two office uses. (Figure A-34, STA 702+00, and Figure A-35, STA 705+00)
 - Five acres south of The Alameda on either side of Montgomery Street. This site includes an optional station entrance for the Diridon/Arena Station. These sites are publicly owned paved parking areas. No residential or business relocation would be required. (Figure A-36 and A-39, STA 733+00)
 - Thirteen acres on either side of I-880 west of the rail ROW. These sites include a portion of the BART rail alignment, tunnel portal, and Maintenance Facility. The relocation affects are discussed below. (Figure A-42, STA 820+00)

Nine acres on east side of rail ROW north of Brokaw Road. This site would be acquired as a
part of the Santa Clara Station – Parking Structure North Option. To accommodate this staging
area and the station option, 1 industrial use would be relocated. (Figure A-43, STA 875+00)

A more detailed discussion of the BART Alternative staging areas is provided in Section 4.19.2.8, *Construction/Construction Staging Sites*.

- Bulk Substation/Switching Station #3: The location of this facility is proposed for vacant industrial land and would not require the displacement of any business or residence. (Figure A-42, STA 824+00)
- Maintenance Facility and Shops, and Gap Breaker Station #2: The proposed location of these facilities would require the acquisition of both occupied and vacant properties. The acquisition of occupied properties would require the demolition of industrial buildings and the relocation of businesses located on the parcels. The Maintenance Facility would also require the acquisition of the UPRR ROW; however, no relocation is required for the portion of the ROW in San Jose. (Figure A-42)

<u>City of Santa Clara</u>

Within the City of Santa Clara, the BART Alternative and MOS scenarios would require acquisition of property and related relocation for the following uses:

Rail Corridor

The BART Alternative would be located aboveground along a new alignment located east of the UPRR Newhall Yard. The line would require acquisition of 1 vacant industrial property that would not displace any business or residence. In addition, the UPRR ROW would be acquired resulting in the relocation of a rail transfer facility. (Figure A-42)

Station Areas

• Santa Clara Station: There are two options for the Santa Clara Station. The Parking Structure North Option would require the relocation of 1 light industrial business and up to 3 retail uses and 2 restaurants. The Parking Structure South Option would require the relocation of 2 light industrial businesses and up to 3 retail uses and 2 restaurants. (Figures A-43 and A-45, and Figures B-40 and B-42)

Support Facilities

Support facilities to be constructed in Santa Clara include a portion of the maintenance facility and other facilities.

- **Maintenance Facility:** The Maintenance Facility requires the acquisition of the UPRR ROW but does not result in any additional relocation beyond a rail transfer facility described above. (Figures A-42 and A-43)
- **Support Facilities:** Support facilities at the end of the line include additional tail track and facilities for storage, maintenance, and switching. The tail track would require the relocation of up to 10 industrial businesses including 75 rental storage units. (Figure A-43)
- **TPSS #10:** This traction power substation would be located at the west end of the Maintenance Facility, east of the Santa Clara Station. No businesses or residences would require relocation (Figure A-42)

4.15.3.2 Design Requirements and Best Management Practices

Baseline and BART Alternatives

All displacement and relocation activities will be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970 (Uniform Act) for the Baseline and BART alternatives, as well as the MOS scenarios. The Uniform Act ensures the fair and equitable treatment of persons whose real property is acquired or who are displaced as a result of a federal or federally-assisted project. Government-wide regulations provide procedural and other requirements (appraisals, payment of fair market value, notice to owners, etc.) in the acquisition of real property and provide for relocation payments and advisory assistance in the relocation of persons and businesses.

Applying the Uniform Act to the San Jose Flea Market vendors varies depending on the duration and type of lease a vendor is under. Some vendors have daily permits and as such would not be eligible. Others have weekly, monthly, or annual leases and may be eligible. Eligibility is determined at the time of acquisition. At the appropriate time, each vendor will be interviewed and lease documentation will be reviewed to determine eligibility in accordance with the Act.

VTA's Relocation Program, which complies with federal relocation requirements, provides assistance to affected residence and business owners. This assistance, which varies on a case-by-case basis, can be both financial (e.g., moving costs, rent subsidies, relocation costs, personal property losses, reestablishment expenses, etc.) and technical (e.g., providing information regarding suitable replacement sites, providing referrals, assisting with lease negotiations, assisting with moving logistics, etc.). Business owners also have the option of receiving a fixed payment in lieu of the payments for actual moving and related expenses and actual reasonable reestablishment expenses.

When acquisition occurs, properties are appraised at fair market value and offers are based on the approved appraised values. For relocation, the availability of alternate sites will vary; however, the current economy is characterized by a comfortable vacancy rate in the project area, which could easily accommodate the need for relocation space in a similar price range. Table 4.15-9 shows recent vacancy rate ranges for commercial properties in the SVRTC cities. In addition, with a current housing stock of over 1.5 million units in Santa Clara County, the one to five residential relocations associated with the BART Alternative will be easily accommodated.

The provisions of VTA's Relocation Program will minimize any adverse effects of the business and residential relocations associated with the Baseline or BART Alternative, as well as the MOS scenarios.

Table 4.15-9: Commercial Vacancy Rates for SVRTC Cities								
Type of Space	Vacan	cy Rate						
Type of Space	Low	High						
Office	9.1%	36.1%						
Research and Development	21.2%	27.1%						
Manufacturing	7.4%	12.0%						
Warehouse	5.6%	18.4%						
Source: 2000 U.S. Census Data.	Source: 2000 U.S. Census Data.							

4.15.3.3 Mitigation Measures

Projects planned under the No-Action Alternative would undergo separate environmental review to define socioeconomic impacts and to determine appropriate mitigation measures. No significant socioeconomic impacts are associated with the Baseline or BART Alternatives, or the MOS scenarios; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

This page intentionally left blank.