

3.7 SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

3.7.1 SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SONOMA COUNTY

POPULATION

Regional Population

As shown in **Table 3.7-1**, the 2004 population of Sonoma and Marin Counties is estimated to be about 722,900. A large proportion of the regional population resides in unincorporated Sonoma

TABLE 3.7-1
REGIONAL POPULATION

| Location | Population | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | 1990 | 2000 | 2004* |
| Sonoma County (total) | 388,222 | 458,614 | 472,700 |
| Cloverdale | 4,924 | 6,831 | 7,925 |
| Cotati | 5,714 | 6,471 | 7,025 |
| Healdsburg | 9,469 | 10,722 | 11,600 |
| Petaluma | 43,166 | 54,548 | 55,900 |
| Rohnert Park | 36,326 | 42,236 | 42,150 |
| Santa Rosa | 113,261 | 147,595 | 154,400 |
| Sebastopol | 7,008 | 7,774 | 7,750 |
| Sonoma | 8,168 | 9,128 | 9,675 |
| Windsor | 0 | 22,744 | 24,800 |
| Unincorporated County | 160,186 | 150,565 | 151,600 |
| Marin County (total) | 230,096 | 247,289 | 250,200 |
| Belvedere | 2,147 | 2,125 | 2,130 |
| Corte Madera | 8,272 | 9,100 | 9,350 |
| Fairfax | 6,931 | 7,319 | 7,300 |
| Larkspur | 11,068 | 12,014 | 12,000 |
| Mill Valley | 13,029 | 13,600 | 13,600 |
| Novato | 47,585 | 47,630 | 49,400 |
| Ross | 2,136 | 2,329 | 2,350 |
| San Anselmo | 11,735 | 12,378 | 12,350 |
| San Rafael | 48,410 | 56,063 | 56,900 |
| Sausalito | 7,152 | 7,330 | 7,325 |
| Tiburon | 7,554 | 8,666 | 8,775 |
| Unincorporated County | 64,077 | 68,735 | 68,700 |
| Sonoma and Marin Counties (total) | 618,318 | 705,903 | 722,900 |
| State of California (total) | 29,758,213 | 33,871,648 | 36,144,000 |

NOTES: * Projected estimate.

SOURCE: California Department of Finance, 2004b, 2004d, 2004e.

County, with the City of Santa Rosa ranking as the largest city, more than double the population of the next largest city. The Wilfred site, Stony Point site and the Lakeville site are located in unincorporated Sonoma County. The Wilfred site and Stony Point site are located adjacent to the City of Rohnert Park and near the Cities of Cotati, Santa Rosa, and Sebastopol. The Cities of Novato, Petaluma, and Sonoma are located closest to the Lakeville site, although all neighboring cities are more than five miles from the Lakeville site.

Population Trends

The population of Sonoma County grew from 388,222 people in 1990 to about 458,614 people in 2000, an increase of 18.1 percent. As of January 2004, the County's population has grown to 472,700, an increase of approximately 3 percent since 2000. Marin County has grown more slowly than Sonoma County, growing from 230,096 people in 1990 to 247,289 people in 2000, an increase of 7.5 percent. The County's population increase has slowed further in recent years, increasing approximately 1 percent since 2000.

The populations of Rohnert Park, Cotati, and Sebastopol increased moderately, but at a slower rate than Sonoma County as a whole from 1990 to 2000. Rohnert Park grew from 36,326 people in 1990 to about 42,236 people in 2000, an increase of 16.3 percent. During the same time period, Cotati's population increased by 13.2 percent and Sebastopol's population increased by 10.9 percent. The population of Santa Rosa has increased at a faster rate than Sonoma County from 1990 to 2000. Santa Rosa's population grew from 113,261 to 147,595 from 1990 to 2000, an increase of approximately 30 percent. As of January 2004, the population of Cotati, Sebastopol, and Santa Rosa has continued to grow, while Rohnert Park's populations have decreased slightly.

HOUSING

As shown in **Table 3.7-2**, there are currently about 297,422 housing units in Sonoma and Marin Counties. Of the 297,422 regional housing units, 15,426 were vacant in 2004. Regional vacancy rates ranged from 1.80 to 11.94 and averaged at 5.19. As shown in **Table 3.7-3**, 2004 vacancy rates are generally low, when compared with historical rates since 1990. The Cities of Rohnert Park, Cotati, Santa Rosa, and Sebastopol have some of the lowest housing vacancy rates in the region, ranging from 1.93 to 2.68 in 2004. A total of 2,074 housing units were vacant in these four cities in 2004.

The 2000 Census provides Journey to Work data, which estimates the county of residence for employees that work in Rohnert Park, as well as other locations within the Bay Area. According to the Census data, approximately 33-percent of all Rohnert Park employees live within Rohnert Park, and 28-percent of employees live within Santa Rosa, with the remainder living elsewhere in the Bay Area. Additionally, within Rohnert Park there are approximately 1.46 jobs per household

TABLE 3.7-2
2004 REGIONAL HOUSING ESTIMATES

| Location | Total Housing Units* | Percent Vacant* | Estimated Vacant Units* |
|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Sonoma County (total) | 190,591 | 5.79 | 11,026 |
| Cloverdale | 3,088 | 4.73 | 146 |
| Cotati | 2,842 | 2.08 | 59 |
| Healdsburg | 4,515 | 4.08 | 184 |
| Petaluma | 21,087 | 1.84 | 387 |
| Rohnert Park | 15,977 | 1.93 | 308 |
| Santa Rosa | 61,130 | 2.68 | 1,636 |
| Sebastopol | 3,351 | 2.12 | 71 |
| Sonoma | 5,018 | 6.30 | 316 |
| Windsor | 8,534 | 1.80 | 154 |
| Unincorporated County | 65,049 | 11.94 | 7,765 |
| Marin County (total) | 106,831 | 4.12 | 4,400 |
| Belvedere | 1,065 | 9.67 | 103 |
| Corte Madera | 3,974 | 1.91 | 76 |
| Fairfax | 3,421 | 3.27 | 112 |
| Larkspur | 6,424 | 4.22 | 271 |
| Mill Valley | 6,318 | 2.20 | 139 |
| Novato | 19,852 | 2.79 | 553 |
| Ross | 814 | 5.41 | 44 |
| San Anselmo | 5,412 | 2.61 | 141 |
| San Rafael | 23,398 | 2.51 | 588 |
| Sausalito | 4,529 | 5.67 | 257 |
| Tiburon | 3,952 | 4.66 | 184 |
| Unincorporated County | 27,672 | 6.98 | 1,932 |
| <i>Regional Total</i> | <i>297,422</i> | <i>5.19</i> | <i>15,426</i> |

NOTES: * Projected estimate. These figures do not include seasonal, recreational, or occasional use residences.

SOURCE: California Department of Finance, 2004c.

(jobs/housing ratio). The jobs/housing ratio for Santa Rosa and Sonoma County is 1.20 and 1.45 (Bay Area Economics, 2008).

EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME

Employment

Table 3.7-4 displays labor force participation and employment rates for Sonoma County, Marin County, and the San Francisco Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) (now known as the San Francisco-San Mateo-Redwood City Metropolitan Division of the San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont MSA). The labor force is generally defined as those employed workers and unemployed

TABLE 3.7-3
HISTORICAL VACANCY RATES

| Location | Housing Vacancy Rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
| Sonoma County | 6.97 | 7.48 | 7.46 | 7.43 | 7.45 | 7.42 | 7.40 | 7.38 | 7.37 | 7.34 | 5.87 | 5.84 | 5.82 | 5.80 | 5.79 |
| Cloverdale | 8.12 | 8.11 | 8.11 | 8.12 | 8.13 | 8.11 | 8.13 | 8.13 | 8.14 | 8.15 | 4.73 | 4.72 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.73 |
| Cotati | 6.25 | 6.23 | 6.26 | 6.26 | 6.23 | 6.23 | 6.25 | 6.23 | 6.22 | 6.23 | 2.05 | 2.05 | 2.05 | 2.07 | 2.08 |
| Healdsburg | 4.06 | 4.06 | 4.07 | 4.07 | 4.07 | 4.05 | 4.05 | 4.05 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 4.06 | 4.05 | 4.06 | 4.07 | 4.08 |
| Petaluma | 2.93 | 2.92 | 2.92 | 2.93 | 2.93 | 2.92 | 2.92 | 2.92 | 2.92 | 2.92 | 1.83 | 1.83 | 1.83 | 1.83 | 1.84 |
| Rohnert Park | 3.64 | 3.64 | 3.64 | 3.64 | 3.64 | 3.63 | 3.63 | 3.63 | 3.63 | 3.64 | 1.93 | 1.93 | 1.93 | 1.93 | 1.93 |
| Santa Rosa | 4.23 | 4.23 | 4.23 | 4.23 | 4.23 | 4.23 | 4.23 | 4.23 | 4.20 | 4.20 | 2.68 | 2.68 | 2.68 | 2.68 | 2.68 |
| Sebastopol | 3.13 | 3.12 | 3.12 | 3.13 | 3.12 | 3.13 | 3.11 | 3.13 | 3.12 | 3.12 | 2.14 | 2.13 | 2.13 | 2.12 | 2.12 |
| Sonoma | 8.30 | 8.31 | 8.30 | 8.29 | 8.30 | 8.30 | 8.31 | 8.31 | 8.30 | 8.30 | 6.29 | 6.29 | 6.29 | 6.29 | 6.30 |
| Windsor | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7.81 | 7.81 | 7.81 | 7.81 | 7.81 | 7.82 | 7.82 | 1.80 | 1.80 | 1.80 | 1.81 | 1.80 |
| Unincorporated County | 12.05 | 12.05 | 12.05 | 12.39 | 12.48 | 12.48 | 12.48 | 12.48 | 12.72 | 12.72 | 11.94 | 11.94 | 11.95 | 11.95 | 11.94 |
| Marin County | 4.76 | 4.78 | 4.78 | 4.81 | 4.91 | 5.07 | 5.70 | 6.20 | 5.94 | 5.93 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.12 |
| Belvedere | 7.04 | 7.03 | 7.03 | 7.03 | 7.03 | 7.03 | 7.02 | 7.00 | 6.99 | 6.97 | 9.73 | 9.70 | 9.68 | 9.67 | 9.67 |
| Corte Madera | 3.77 | 3.76 | 3.76 | 3.76 | 3.78 | 3.77 | 3.75 | 3.75 | 3.75 | 3.75 | 1.92 | 1.92 | 1.91 | 1.91 | 1.91 |
| Fairfax | 4.12 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.13 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.10 | 3.28 | 3.28 | 3.27 | 3.27 | 3.27 |
| Larkspur | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.23 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.22 |
| Mill Valley | 3.00 | 3.01 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 2.99 | 2.99 | 2.98 | 2.98 | 2.21 | 2.21 | 2.20 | 2.20 | 2.20 |
| Novato | 2.91 | 3.00 | 2.97 | 2.98 | 3.31 | 4.20 | 7.59 | 10.31 | 8.93 | 8.86 | 2.47 | 2.41 | 2.53 | 2.75 | 2.79 |
| Ross | 5.68 | 5.66 | 5.66 | 5.65 | 5.64 | 5.64 | 5.62 | 5.62 | 5.61 | 5.57 | 5.47 | 5.46 | 5.43 | 5.41 | 5.41 |
| San Anselmo | 3.76 | 3.75 | 3.75 | 3.75 | 3.77 | 3.75 | 3.75 | 3.74 | 3.73 | 3.73 | 2.61 | 2.61 | 2.61 | 2.61 | 2.61 |
| San Rafael | 3.99 | 3.99 | 3.99 | 3.99 | 3.99 | 3.99 | 3.99 | 3.99 | 3.99 | 3.99 | 2.51 | 2.51 | 2.51 | 2.51 | 2.51 |
| Sausalito | 6.51 | 6.51 | 6.50 | 6.50 | 6.52 | 6.52 | 6.53 | 6.53 | 6.52 | 6.53 | 5.70 | 5.69 | 5.68 | 5.68 | 5.67 |
| Tiburon | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.64 | 4.64 | 4.64 | 4.64 | 4.63 | 4.62 | 4.62 | 4.63 | 4.65 | 4.64 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.66 |
| Unincorporated County | 7.35 | 7.36 | 7.39 | 7.51 | 7.64 | 7.60 | 7.60 | 7.59 | 7.59 | 7.59 | 7.19 | 7.19 | 7.19 | 6.98 | 6.98 |

NOTES: All rates are based on California Department of Finance estimates except for 1990 and 2000, which are based on U.S. Census counts. These figures do not include seasonal, recreational, or occasional use residences. Historically low rates during the shown time period are italicized.

SOURCE: California Department of Finance, 2004a, 2004c.

workers actively looking for work. The San Francisco MSA includes Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties. San Francisco and San Mateo Counties are located south of Marin County. A substantial portion of the working labor force in Sonoma County and particularly Marin County commutes to jobs to the south and east.

Sonoma County had a labor force of 257,544 in 2003, approximately 70-percent of the total population over age 16. Unemployment rates are relatively low throughout the region, albeit somewhat higher than historically low levels. The 2003 unemployment rate in Sonoma County was 4.9-percent, 2.3-percent higher than the 2000 unemployment rate, which was the lowest unemployment rate since 1990.

TABLE 3.7-4
LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

| | Sonoma County (2003) | Sonoma County Peak (1990-2003) | Sonoma County Peak (year) | Rohnert Park (2003) | Rohnert Park Peak (1990-2003) | Rohnert Park Peak (year) | Marin County (2003) | Marin County Peak (1990-2003) | Marin County Peak (year) | Novato (2003) | Novato Peak (1990-2003) | Novato Peak (year) | San Fran. MSA ³ (2003) | San Fran. MSA ³ Peak (1990-2003) | San Fran. MSA ³ Peak (year) |
|---|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Total Population Over 16¹ | 366,732 | | | 32,288 | | | 205,988 | | | 38,047 | | | 5,506,184 | | |
| Labor Force | 257,544 | | | 25,791 | | | 129,749 | | | 25,836 | | | 3,607,246 | | |
| Labor Force Participation Rate² | 70% | 72% | 2001-2002 | 80% | 82% | 2002 | 63% | 69.7% | 1990 | 67.9% | 75.3% | 2000 | 66% | 69% | 2001 |
| Unemployment Rate | 4.9% | 2.6% | 2000 | 5.5% | 2.6% | 1999-2000 | 3.9% | 1.6% | 2000 | 3.5% | 1.5% | 2000 | 6.5% | 2.5% | 2000 |

NOTES: ¹ Assumes that the age distribution is not changing for the percent of the population over age 16.

² Labor force participation rate equals the labor force divided by the total population over age 16.

³ San Francisco Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) includes San Francisco, San Mateo, and Marin Counties.

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004; U.S. Census Bureau, 1990, 2000; Bay Area Economics, 2008.

As shown in **Table 3.7-5**, Sonoma County mirrors employment by industry for the State of California. Sonoma County is similar to the San Francisco MSA as well, except for two industries: manufacturing and professional and business services. Manufacturing represents 14-percent of Sonoma County employment, compared to 5-percent for the San Francisco MSA. Professional and business services represents 19-percent of San Francisco MSA employment, compared to 10-percent for Sonoma County.

Income

Table 3.7-6 displays key income and poverty data for Sonoma County, San Francisco MSA, and California. As shown, median household income for Sonoma County was \$54,614 in 2003, which is slightly greater than the State, at \$50,220. The median household income within the San Francisco MSA was \$80,323 in 2003, which is much higher than the State. The relatively high median household income levels that are present in Sonoma County and the San Francisco MSA indicate both a robust economy and a high cost of living.

Poverty-level information is also shown in **Table 3.7-6**. As shown, both Sonoma County and the San Francisco MSA rank below the State in percent of population below the poverty level. The poverty level is uniform throughout the United States and is not adjusted regionally for cost of living (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005). Thus, Sonoma County and the San Francisco MSA's relatively low percentages of people below the poverty level may be somewhat misleading given the high cost of living in the region.

TABLE 3.7-5
EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY (2003)

| Industry | Sonoma County | | San Francisco MSA | | California | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|
| | No. Employed | Percent of Total | No. Employed | Percent of Total | No. Employed | Percent of Total |
| Total, All Industries | 186,300 | 100 | 956,300 | 100 | 14,785,200 | 100 |
| Total Farm | 5,700 | 3 | 3,600 | <1 | 375,000 | 3 |
| Total Nonfarm | 180,600 | 97 | 952,800 | 99 | 14,410,200 | 97 |
| Goods Producing | 38,200 | 21 | 89,300 | 9 | 2,355,700 | 16 |
| Natural Resources and Mining | 300 | <1 | 200 | <1 | 22,000 | <1 |
| Construction | 12,800 | 7 | 43,600 | 5 | 788,800 | 5 |
| Manufacturing | 25,200 | 14 | 45,500 | 5 | 1,544,900 | 10 |
| Service Providing | 142,400 | 76 | 863,400 | 90 | 12,054,400 | 82 |
| Trade, Transportation and Utilities | 33,700 | 18 | 169,100 | 18 | 2,722,000 | 18 |
| Information | 3,900 | 2 | 47,000 | 5 | 471,400 | 3 |
| Financial Activities | 10,400 | 6 | 90,700 | 9 | 886,800 | 6 |
| Professional and Business Services | 18,800 | 10 | 177,700 | 19 | 2,108,100 | 14 |
| Educational and Health Services | 22,700 | 12 | 97,800 | 10 | 1,536,300 | 10 |
| Leisure and Hospitality | 19,700 | 11 | 112,300 | 12 | 1,397,600 | 10 |
| Other Services | 6,400 | 3 | 37,900 | 4 | 505,800 | 3 |
| Government | 26,800 | 14 | 131,000 | 14 | 2,426,500 | 16 |

NOTES: Data is not adjusted for seasonality. Percentages may not add to 100 percent due to rounding.
Percentages rounded to nearest one percent.

SOURCE: California Economic Development Department, 2005; AES, 2005.

TABLE 3.7-6
REGIONAL INCOME AND POVERTY (2003)

| | Median Household Income (dollars) | Number Below Poverty Level* | | | Percent of Population Below Poverty Level* (Individuals) |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-------------|--|
| | | Families | Families with Female Householder, No Husband Present | Individuals | |
| Sonoma County | 54,614 | 7,258 | 3,886 | 40,641 | 8.9 |
| San Francisco MSA | 80,323 | 19,777 | 9,158 | 126,536 | 7.7 |
| California | 50,220 | 848,512 | 402,224 | 4,610,036 | 13.4 |

NOTES: * In determining the poverty level, the U.S. Census Bureau uses income thresholds that vary from \$9,060 to \$42,039 based on age and family size.

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau, 2003, 2004.

3.7.2 SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TRIBE

The Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria are comprised of 1,076 individuals. The Tribe has grown rapidly over the past few years, primarily due to new enrollment. An estimate of the geographical distribution of Tribal members is shown in **Table 3.7-7**. As shown, a majority of Tribal members have moved out of the Tribe's ancestral territory. However, approximately 42-percent of Tribal members continue to live in either Sonoma or Marin County. Approximately 13-percent of Tribal members reported living with multiple families (Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, 2004a). In a 2002 Tribal survey, 16-percent of members reported living in overcrowded residences (Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, 2002).

TABLE 3.7-7
FEDERATED INDIANS OF GRATON RANCHERIA –
TRIBAL LOCATION BY COUNTY (2004)

| County | Percent of Tribe |
|------------|------------------|
| Sonoma | 38 |
| Marin | 4 |
| Lake | 3 |
| Mendocino | 1 |
| Sacramento | 3 |
| Solano | 2 |
| Yolo | 4 |
| Other | 46 |

SOURCE: Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, 2004a.

In general, the economy of the Tribe lags well behind the economy of the local community. According to a 2002 Tribal survey, the Tribal unemployment rate was approximately 13-percent, about double the unemployment rates of Sonoma County, Rohnert Park, and the San Francisco MSA (see **Table 3.7-4**) (Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, 2002). Tribal household income distribution is shown in **Table 3.7-8**. As shown, 72-percent of Tribal households had household incomes of less than \$50,000 in 2004. Twenty-percent of Tribal households had household incomes ranging from \$10,000 to \$20,000 (Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, 2004a). By comparison, median household incomes for Sonoma County, the San Francisco MSA, and the State were, \$54,614, \$80,323, and \$50,220 respectively in 2003. Six-percent of Tribal members reported that their rental payment exceeds 30-percent of their monthly income. Six-percent also reported rental payments exceeding 50-percent of their monthly income (Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, 2002). These are indicators of high incidences of poverty within the Tribe.

Another indicator of economic health is rate of homeownership. Tribal homeownership rates are low, with approximately 61-percent of Tribal members reporting that they do not own a home. Tribal members (twenty-five percent) reported that their house is in need of repairs (Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, 2004a).

TABLE 3.7-8
FEDERATED INDIANS OF GRATON RANCHERIA –
HOUSEHOLD INCOME (2004)

| Annual Household Income (dollars) | Percent of Tribe |
|--|-------------------------|
| 0-10,000 | 16 |
| 10-20,000 | 21 |
| 20-30,000 | 14 |
| 30-40,000 | 11 |
| 40-50,000 | 10 |
| 50-60,000 | 7 |
| 60-70,000 | 6 |
| 70-80,000 | 4 |
| 80,000+ | 11 |

SOURCE: Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, 2004a.

3.7.3 TRIBAL ATTITUDES, EXPECTATIONS, LIFESTYLE AND CULTURE

Both the Tribal government and individual Tribal members participate in area political and social activities. Tribal children attend local area schools and adult Tribal members are employed by local businesses. Altogether, Tribal attitudes and expectations favor increasing participation in, and benefit from, the regional economy, with continuation of the long tradition of comfortable coexistence and cooperation with their non-Indian neighbors.

3.7.4 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

POLICY/REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations, as amended, directs Federal agencies to develop an Environmental Justice Strategy that identifies and addresses disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) has oversight responsibility of the Federal Government's compliance with Executive Order 12898 and NEPA. The CEQ, in consultation with the USEPA and other agencies, has developed guidance to assist Federal agencies with their NEPA procedures so that environmental justice concerns are effectively identified and addressed.

According to guidance from the CEQ (1997b) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA, 1998), agencies should consider the composition of the affected area, to determine whether minority populations, low-income populations, or Indian tribes are present in the area affected by the proposed action, and if so whether there may be disproportionately high and

adverse environmental effects. Communities may be considered “minority” under the executive order if one of the following characteristics apply:

- The cumulative percentage of minorities within a census tract is greater than 50 percent (primary method of analysis) or
- The cumulative percentage of minorities within a census tract is less than 50 percent, but the percentage of minorities is meaningfully greater than the minority population percentage in the general population or other appropriate unit of geographic analysis (secondary method of analysis).

According to the USEPA, either the county or the state can be used when considering the scope of the “general population.” A definition of “meaningfully greater” is not given by the CEQ or USEPA, although the USEPA has noted that any affected area that has a percentage of minorities that is above the state’s percentage is a potential minority community and any affected area with a minority percentage double that of the state’s is a definite minority community under Executive Order 12898.

Communities may be considered “low-income” under the executive order if one of the following characteristics applies:

- The median household income for a census tract is below the poverty line (primary method of analysis) or
- Other indications are present that indicate a low-income community is present within the census tract (secondary method of analysis).

In most cases, the primary method of analysis will suffice to determine whether a low-income community exists in the affected environment. However, when a census tract income may be just over the poverty line or where a low-income pocket within the tract appears likely, the secondary method of analysis may be warranted. Other indications of a low-income community under the secondary method of analysis include limited access to health care, overburdened or aged infrastructure, and dependence on subsistence living.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

To determine whether a proposed action is likely to have disproportionately high and adverse effects, agencies must identify a geographic scale for which they will obtain demographic information.

Census tracts are a small, relatively permanent, statistical subdivision of a county delineated by a local committee of census data users for the purpose of presenting data. Census tract boundaries

normally follow visible features, but may follow governmental unit boundaries or other features. They are designed to be relatively homogeneous units with respect to population characteristics, economic status, and living conditions at the time of establishment.

For the Wilfred and Stony Point sites, the following census tracts were analyzed for characteristics relevant to an environmental justice analysis:

- the census tract that includes the Wilfred and Stony Point sites (tract 1512.01),
- tracts adjacent to tract 1512.01 (except to the south, where tract 1512.01 extends as far south as the City of Petaluma), and
- census tracts where substantial project-generated traffic effects are expected.

Figure 3.7-1 displays the census tracts in the vicinity of the Wilfred and Stony Point sites.

For the Lakeville site, the following census tracts were analyzed for characteristics relevant to an environmental justice analysis:

- the census tract that includes the Lakeville site (tract 1506.06), and
- census tracts where substantial project-generated traffic effects are expected.

In addition, census tracts that are adjacent to tract 1506.06 and relatively close to the Lakeville site were included in the environmental justice analysis. Adjacent census tracts were not necessarily included for the Lakeville site due to the expansive area covered by tract 1506.06.

Figure 3.7-2 displays the census tracts in the vicinity of the Lakeville site.

ETHNIC COMPOSITION

According to the 2000 Census (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003), the Sonoma County region and Rohnert Park area have a predominately Caucasian ethnic composition. However, a significant Latino population also exists in the region, with correspondingly smaller numbers of Native Americans, Asians, and Pacific islanders. The following races are considered minorities under the Executive Order 12898:

- American Indian or Alaskan Native,
- Asian or Pacific Islander,
- Black, not of Hispanic origin, and
- Hispanic.

Populations of two or more races were also considered to be a minority race for the purpose of environmental justice analysis.

Insert Figure 3.7-1, Census Tract Map – Wilfred site and Stony Point site and Vicinity

Figure 3.7-2

Census 2000 data represents the most current racial data available by census tract. Although this data is more than five years old, the racial composition of census tracts is not expected to have changed substantially. Conservative assumptions will be applied to any borderline situations where a minor change in racial composition could affect the minority status of a census tract. **Tables 3.7-9** and **3.7-10** display the population of each minority race according to census tract for the Wilfred site, the Stony Point site, and the Lakeville site and other respective vicinities.

As shown in **Table 3.7-9**, all census tracts in the vicinity of the Wilfred and Stony Point sites are below the 50-percent minority threshold. The highest percentage minority of the census tracts in the vicinity of the Wilfred and Stony Point sites is found in tract 1532, which is 47-percent minority. Tract 1532 has a lower percentage minority when compared to the State (56 percent) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). Thus, tract 1532 is not considered a minority tract under the primary or secondary methods of analysis, as outlined above.

Tract 1532 is a relatively large tract that is adjacent to the northern boundary of the Wilfred and Stony Point sites. This tract is primarily rural residential just north of the Wilfred and Stony Point sites, but includes a portion of urban southern Santa Rosa in the northern portion of the tract most distant from the Wilfred and Stony Point sites. The census tract does not correlate with any communities, but there are no minority communities within it and there are no minority communities in the vicinities of the Wilfred site, the Stony Point site, nor the Lakeville site.

As shown in **Table 3.7-10**, all census tracts in the immediate vicinity of the Lakeville site are well below the 50-percent minority threshold. All of the census tracts in Solano County (outside of the immediate vicinity of the Lakeville site but in an area of potential traffic impacts from a project on the Lakeville site), however, are above the 50-percent minority threshold. These four tracts are located primarily in the City of Vallejo and range from 58 to 80-percent minority. The census tracts in Solano County are therefore considered minority communities. There are no other minority communities present in the vicinity of the Lakeville site.

TRIBAL GAMING

A number of local tribes have been able to improve the socioeconomic conditions of their tribes through gaming. The two Indian gaming casinos that are located nearest to the Wilfred, Stony Point, and Lakeville sites are the River Rock Casino in Geyserville (pop. 2,400), and Twin Pine Casino in Middletown (pop. 1,000). River Rock Casino is in Sonoma County and is approximately 31 miles from the Wilfred site and Stony Point site and 43 miles from the Lakeville site. Twin Pine Casino is in Lake County and is approximately 37 miles from the Wilfred and Stony Point sites and 47 miles from the Lakeville site.

TABLE 3.7-9
MINORITY POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT – WILFRED SITE, STONY POINT SITE AND VICINITY

| | Total population: Total | Total population: Hispanic or Latino | Total population: Not Hispanic or Latino; Population of one race; Black or African American alone | Total population: Not Hispanic or Latino; Population of one race; American Indian and Alaska Native alone | Total population: Not Hispanic or Latino; Population of one race; Asian alone | Total population: Not Hispanic or Latino; Population of one race; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | Total population: Not Hispanic or Latino; Population of one race; Some other race alone, other than white | Total population: Not Hispanic or Latino; Population of two–six races | Total population: Minority | Percent Minority* |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|---|----------------------------|-------------------|
| Census Tract 1512.01, Sonoma County | 6,106 | 845 | 63 | 66 | 168 | 7 | 17 | 208 | 1374 | 23 |
| Census Tract 1512.04, Sonoma County | 3,409 | 391 | 79 | 20 | 120 | 1 | 5 | 145 | 761 | 21 |
| Census Tract 1513.01, Sonoma County | 4,521 | 863 | 105 | 33 | 187 | 26 | 2 | 245 | 1461 | 32 |
| Census Tract 1513.05, Sonoma County | 5,165 | 1,111 | 148 | 34 | 237 | 21 | 10 | 257 | 1818 | 35 |
| Census Tract 1513.07, Sonoma County | 5,337 | 536 | 62 | 16 | 308 | 23 | 11 | 189 | 1145 | 21 |
| Census Tract 1513.08, Sonoma County | 4,695 | 391 | 61 | 23 | 207 | 13 | 28 | 180 | 903 | 19 |
| Census Tract 1532, Sonoma County | 5,014 | 1,728 | 96 | 88 | 248 | 8 | 16 | 191 | 2375 | 47 |
| Census Tract 1533, Sonoma County | 6,845 | 1,874 | 213 | 120 | 305 | 17 | 13 | 251 | 2793 | 41 |
| Census Tract 1535.01, Sonoma County | 4,612 | 340 | 42 | 19 | 68 | 3 | 15 | 149 | 636 | 14 |

NOTES: * Rounded to the nearest one percent.

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000; AES, 2005.

TABLE 3.7-10
MINORITY POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT – LAKEVILLE SITE AND VICINITY

| | Total population: Total | Total population: Hispanic or Latino | Total population: Not Hispanic or Latino; Population of one race; Black or African American alone | Total population: Not Hispanic or Latino; Population of one race; American Indian and Alaska Native alone | Total population: Not Hispanic or Latino; Population of one race; Asian alone | Total population: Not Hispanic or Latino; Population of one race; Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | Total population: Not Hispanic or Latino; Population of one race; Some other race alone | Total population: Not Hispanic or Latino; Population of two–six races | Total population: Minority | Percent Minority* |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|---|----------------------------|-------------------|
| Census Tract 1011, Marin County | 2,539 | 88 | 18 | 3 | 78 | 10 | 7 | 66 | 270 | 11 |
| Census Tract 2508, Solano County | 149 | 11 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 90 | 60 |
| Census Tract 2517.01, Solano County | 4,068 | 739 | 960 | 35 | 599 | 56 | 3 | 232 | 2,624 | 65 |
| Census Tract 2517.02, Solano County | 2,073 | 360 | 622 | 3 | 445 | 8 | 1 | 119 | 1,558 | 75 |
| Census Tract 2518.02, Solano County | 1,537 | 364 | 188 | 27 | 246 | 7 | 3 | 61 | 896 | 58 |
| Census Tract 2518.03, Solano County | 5,242 | 1,135 | 803 | 15 | 1,793 | 115 | 14 | 291 | 4,166 | 80 |
| Census Tract 1501, Sonoma County | 2,670 | 401 | 3 | 20 | 35 | 1 | 2 | 32 | 494 | 19 |
| Census Tract 1506.06, Sonoma County | 7,210 | 945 | 67 | 23 | 371 | 5 | 19 | 202 | 1,632 | 23 |

NOTES: * Rounded to the nearest one percent.

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000; AES, 2005.

River Rock Casino

River Rock Casino in Geyserville has been open since 2002 and is owned by the 768-member Dry Creek Rancheria Band of Pomo Indians. The River Rock Casino facility is a 70,000 square-foot sprung tent structure that includes 35,500 square feet of gaming space. The estimated construction cost for the casino facility was \$40 million. In addition, River Rock is spending an

estimated \$37 million to construct a seven-level parking structure with 1,354 spaces (Bay Area Economics, 2008).

The River Rock facility includes 1,600 slot machines, 16 gaming tables, two restaurants, a wine tasting room, a small gift shop, and a large outdoor patio with a view that overlooks the Alexander Valley. Since it is located 75 miles from San Francisco, the River Rock Casino marketing campaign highlights the facility's status as "The Bay Area's Closest Casino" (Bay Area Economics, 2008).

Published reports quoting statements from River Rock's general manager indicate that 40-percent of the daily visitorship to River Rock arrives by passenger vehicle and 60-percent is brought to the site by River Rock-operated tour buses. According to River Rock's general manager, the casino is visited by 1,200 cars per day with an average of 1.5 patrons per car. Based on these figures, it can be estimated that 1,800 patrons arrive at River Rock each day by car, and another 4,500 arrive via the casino-operated tour buses. This makes a total of 6,300 River Rock patrons per day, and 2,299,500 patrons per year (Bay Area Economics, 2008).

The 2003 operating results for River Rock Casino show annual casino revenues of \$67.1 million. Of this amount, \$60.1 million is generated by slot revenue, and \$7 million is generated by table games revenue. With 1,600 slots and 16 tables, these figures translate to \$103 per slot per day (\$37,563 per slot per year), and \$1,199 per table per day (\$437,500 per table per year) (Bay Area Economics, 2008).

Note that the Dry Creek Band have recently announced plans to expand their River Rock Casino extensively to an approximately 600,000 square foot casino/hotel resort (Santa Rosa Press Democrat, 2007).

Twin Pine Casino

Twin Pine Casino has direct frontage along Highway 29 in Middletown. The casino displays prominent signage and offers an ample parking area. Middletown is known as "The Gateway to Lake County" and is situated half way between Calistoga and Clear Lake. According to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the section of Highway 29 that passes through Middletown has an average daily traffic volume of 9,100 vehicles (Bay Area Economics, 2008).

Twin Pine Casino opened in 1995 and is owned and operated by the Middletown Rancheria Band of Pomo Indians. The new Twin Pine Casino facility is a sprung tent structure that has replaced the original 2,500 square foot casino building. With approximately 5,000 square feet of gaming space, 500 slot machines, eight gaming tables, a café that does not serve alcohol, and a location that is not in itself a destination, Twin Pine Casino cannot be viewed as a significant tourist

attraction in comparison to the River Rock Casino. Rather, Twin Pine Casino takes advantage of its Highway 29 location by catering mainly to passing motorists, travelers driving to Clear Lake, and the resident market within a 30-minute drive (Bay Area Economics, 2008).

No financial data is available for Twin Pine Casino; however, given its smaller size, fewer amenities, and location that is further away from a substantial population base as compared to River Rock, it is likely that Twin Pine generates substantially less revenue overall than River Rock and it is also likely that Twin Pine generates lower revenues than River Rock on an average per slot machine basis (Bay Area Economics, 2008).

INCOME

Census 2000 data represents the most current household income data available by census tract. The use of older income data is expected to result in a conservative estimate of income, given that income levels tend to rise over the years due to inflation. The Census 2000 income data is compared to 2004 poverty levels, which also results in a conservative comparison of income levels to the poverty level.

As shown in **Table 3.7-11**, median household income in census tracts in the vicinity of the Lakeville site is, in all cases, well above the poverty level. Thus, no low-income communities are present in the vicinity of the Lakeville site. As shown in **Table 3.7-12**, median household income in census tracts in the vicinity of the Lakeville site is well above the poverty level, except for census tract 2508 in Solano County. The median household income level for this tract is \$17,188, just above the Federal poverty level. Given Solano County's relatively high-median household income level (\$62,742), cost of living is assumed to be relatively high in the County. Thus, the Federal poverty level is probably set too low to replicate actual poverty conditions in Solano County. Therefore, although median household income for tract 2508 is above the Federal poverty level, it will be considered a low-income community for the purposes of environmental justice analysis. No other low-income communities are present in the vicinity of the Lakeville site.

TABLE 3.7-11
HOUSEHOLD INCOME DATA BY CENSUS TRACT – LAKEVILLE SITE AND VICINITY

| | Households: Median household income in 1999 (dollars) | Occupied housing units: Average household size; Total | 2004 Poverty Level (dollars) * |
|--|--|--|---|
| Census Tract 1512.01, Sonoma County | 42,635 | 2.47 | 15,210 |
| Census Tract 1512.04, Sonoma County | 52,193 | 2.41 | 15,210 |
| Census Tract 1513.01, Sonoma County | 43,631 | 2.82 | 15,210 |
| Census Tract 1513.05, Sonoma County | 38,324 | 2.35 | 15,210 |
| Census Tract 1513.07, Sonoma County | 66,600 | 2.76 | 15,210 |
| Census Tract 1513.08, Sonoma County | 54,750 | 2.46 | 15,210 |
| Census Tract 1532, Sonoma County | 53,088 | 3.38 | 19,803 |
| Census Tract 1533, Sonoma County | 48,926 | 3.01 | 19,803 |
| Census Tract 1535.01, Sonoma County | 60,647 | 2.62 | 15,210 |

NOTES: * Assumes average household size, conservatively rounded up to the nearest person and with a conservative assumption with regards to the number of children under 18 years.

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000, 2004; AES, 2005.

TABLE 3.7-12
HOUSEHOLD INCOME DATA BY CENSUS TRACT – LAKEVILLE SITE AND VICINITY

| | Households: Median household income in 1999 (dollars) | Occupied housing units: Average household size; Total | Poverty Level (dollars) * |
|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| Census Tract 1011, Marin County | 99,899 | 2.61 | 15,210 |
| Census Tract 2508, Solano County | 17,188 | 2.58 | 15,210 |
| Census Tract 2517.01, Solano County | 37,484 | 2.60 | 15,210 |
| Census Tract 2517.02, Solano County | 43,693 | 3.00 | 15,210 |
| Census Tract 2518.02, Solano County | 28,750 | 2.01 | 15,210 |
| Census Tract 2518.03, Solano County | 56,071 | 3.57 | 19,803 |
| Census Tract 1501, Sonoma County | 55,000 | 2.57 | 15,210 |
| Census Tract 1506.06, Sonoma County | 77,281 | 2.79 | 15,210 |

NOTES: * Assumes average household size, conservatively rounded up to the nearest person and with a conservative assumption with regards to the number of children under 18 years.

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000, 2004; AES, 2005.