

CHAPTER 5
POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING

5.0 POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

As the proposed project's residential and commercial land uses would bring additional residents and employees to this unincorporated area of Placer County, this chapter describes the proposed project's potential impacts on population, employment, and housing, including affordable housing. It characterizes the study area's current population and housing stock; assesses changes to the area's population, employment, and housing; determines whether any alteration of the jobs/housing balance will occur; and identifies the proposed project's impacts on the area's affordable housing stock.

As mentioned in the Project Description, the proposed project is governed by the goals and policies of the *Placer County General Plan*, as well as the County's *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan*. For data analysis purposes, the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan Area (Specific Plan Area of Plan Area) is part of the Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Roseville Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). This SMSA establishes the area's designation for demographic analysis and publication of statistical data from the U.S. Census Bureau and other federal agencies.

5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

This section describes the current and projected future population, employment, and housing trends in the Study Area.

5.1.1 Population

Formerly a rural area located between the state capitol of Sacramento and the recreation destination of Lake Tahoe, Placer County has become one of the fastest-growing regions in California. A housing boom has emerged in the wake of new industry and commercial job growth, which in turn is transforming the once-rural areas of south Placer County into rapidly urbanizing communities.

This section describes population growth trends and household characteristics in south Placer County. Figures are derived from U.S. Census Bureau data; Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG) Projection Data for Housing, Population, and Employment by Regional Analysis Districts (RAD) (SACOG, 2002) (Note: Data included were for the West Placer RAD); and Placer County's Economic and Demographic Profile (Placer County, 2005).

Current Population and Population Growth Trends

Positive economic and housing trends in the early and late 1990s spurred tremendous growth in Placer County that continues today. The growth boom has put Placer County near the top of the list of the fastest-growing regions in the state. As presented in Table 5-1, Census data indicate that population growth from 1990 to 2004 in Placer County (84 percent) far outpaces that of the state overall (21 percent) and nearby Sacramento County (31 percent).

Demographic data from Placer County projects that this growth trend will continue to 2020. The County's Economic and Demographic Profile (2005) predicts that Placer County's population growth will jump 35 percent between 2005 and 2015, which is higher than the population growth projected for the state (17 percent) and the greater Sacramento area (26 percent) for that same time period (Table 5-2). The greater Sacramento area includes El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties.

**Table 5-1
Population Growth (1999-2004)**

Area	1990	2000	% change from 1990	2005	% change from 1999-2004
Placer County	172,796	248,399	43.8%	317,028	83.5%
Sacramento County	1,041,219	1,223,499	17.5%	1,363,482	31.0%
California	29,760,021	33,871,648	13.8%	36,132,147	21.4%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2004a, 2000, 1990

**Table 5-2
Projected Population Growth (2005-2015)**

Area	2005 (Projected)	2010 (Projected)	2015 (Projected)	% change from 2005-2015
Placer County	305,675	364,936	413,184	35.2%
Greater Sacramento Area	2,192,359	2,492,224	2,757,047	25.8%
California	36,810,358	40,200,000	43,200,000	17.4%

Source: Placer County, 2005

The Plan Area is located in the Dry Creek area, an unincorporated part of Placer County. While Dry Creek’s population numbers and growth rates may seem small compared to countywide data, there are numerous developments proposed for this area, which will increase its population numbers (Table 5-3).

**Table 5-3
Population of Dry Creek Area**

Area	1990	1995	2000	2001	% change from 1909-2001
Dry Creek Area	932	1,001	1,062	1,059	13.6%

Source: SACOG, 2002

Age

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, individuals from 25 to 44 years old constitute the largest age category, comprising nearly 30 percent of the County’s population. This may indicate the number of working professionals who live or have moved to Placer County for employment reasons. The second largest age group is children and youth under 18 (26.5 percent), followed by older adults aged 45 to 64 years old (24.5 percent) (Table 5-4).

**Table 5-4
Age of Placer County Residents**

Age category	Number	Percent
Under 18 years	65,826	26.5%
18 to 24 years	17,140	6.9%
25 to 44 years	72,036	29.0%
45 to 64 years	60,858	24.5%
65 and over	32,540	13.1%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000a

The 2000 Census also records the County’s median age at 38, which contrasts with Sacramento County’s median age of 34 and the state’s median age of 33. This higher median age may be connected to the greater proportion of established professional households with high-tech jobs and the relatively large proportion of retirees in Placer County.

Income

Overall, Placer County residents have relatively high incomes. As shown in Table 5-5, an income analysis from the County’s Economic and Demographic Profile indicates that the County’s per capita income is 18 percent higher than Sacramento County’s and 10 percent higher than the state average. Additionally, Placer County’s increase in per capita income between 1993 and 2003 was over 50 percent, which is also higher than that of the greater Sacramento area and California overall.

**Table 5-5
Per Capita Income**

Area	1993	2003	Percent change
Placer County	\$24,193	\$36,613	51.3%
Sacramento Region	\$20,936	\$30,908	47.6%
California	\$22,635	\$33,415	47.6%

Source: Placer County, 2005

5.1.2 Employment

Employment rates in Placer County have been on an upward swing for about the past 15 years, reflecting the steady migration of residents and companies to the area. The County’s Economic and Demographic Profile (2006) reports an increase of more than 57 percent in its civilian labor force between 1994 and 2004. This is more than double the Sacramento region’s labor force growth of 27 percent and California’s overall growth of 15 percent. All major industries in Placer County showed positive growth during this period, with notable rises in construction (244 percent), agriculture (133 percent), financial activities (118 percent), and trade, transportation, and utilities (98 percent).

This steady employment growth has kept unemployment low in Placer County. In fact, from 1999 to 2004, including during the most recent economic downturn in early 2000, Placer County’s unemployment rates have been lower than those for the region and state, as shown in Table 5-6. According to the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics, Placer County’s employment base grew by 4.9 percent to 123,500 from March 2002 through March 2003, which was the largest percentage gain in the entire U.S. (Sacramento Business Journal, 2003).

**Table 5-6
Unemployment Rates (1998-2003)**

Area	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Placer County	3.3%	3.6%	3.9%	4.7%	4.8%	4.6%
Sacramento region	4.6%	4.6%	4.8%	5.8%	6.0%	5.7%
California	5.3%	5.0%	5.4%	6.7%	6.8%	6.2%

Source: Placer County, 2006

Major Employers

The largest employers, as ranked by number of employees, in Placer County are listed in Table 5-7. These primarily include companies working in the information technology, entertainment/recreation, and health care industries.

**Table 5-7
Largest Employers in Southwest Placer County
(Ranked by number of employees in 2005)**

Employer	Number of Employees
1. Hewlett Packard	4,000
2. Thunder Valley Casino	2,200
3. Kaiser Permanente	1,847
4. Squaw Valley Ski Corporation	1,500
5. Sutter Roseville Medical Center	1,319
6. Raley's Inc.	1,135
7. Union Pacific Railroad	1,062
8. PRIDE Industries	1,060
9. SureWest Communications	760
10. NEC Electronics America Inc.	710

Source: Placer County, 2005

Commute Patterns

Commute patterns of Placer County workers and residents were determined using Census 2000 data (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000a; Table 5-8). The mean travel time for Placer County residents to get to work is 27.0 minutes for workers 16 years of age and older. This was comparable to that of the state (27.7) but higher than Sacramento County (25.4).

Table 5-8
Travel Time to Work for Placer County Workers 16 Years and Over

Commute Time	Number	Percentage
Less than 5 minutes	3,761	3.4%
5 to 9 minutes	12,476	11.4%
10 to 14 minutes	15,873	14.5%
15 to 19 minutes	15,389	14.1%
20 to 24 minutes	13,294	12.1%
25 to 29 minutes	5,958	5.4%
30 to 34 minutes	14,768	13.5%
35 to 39 minutes	4,205	3.8%
40 to 44 minutes	5,028	4.6%
45 to 59 minutes	10,448	9.5%
60 to 89 minutes	4,945	4.5%
90 or more minutes	3,373	3.1%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000a

5.1.3 Housing

This section describes the housing unit inventory, housing costs, and population forecasts for South Placer communities in proximity to the Plan Area. Current inventory is derived from SACOG's 2002 Population and Housing Estimates, and residential growth projections are based on SACOG's Housing, Population, and Employment Projection Data for 2005-2025. (SACOG's RADs are used, as they include unincorporated West Placer County, which encompasses the Dry Creek area. SACOG divides its six-county region into approximately 70 RADs for analysis purposes.) Median home prices for 1995 and 2005 were obtained from DataQuick, which monitors housing sales trends in California.

The South Placer County region remains relatively affordable as a source of housing when compared with the San Francisco Bay Area or Los Angeles metropolitan areas. Housing prices have generally declined since the early 1990s but have increased over the past 2 to 3 years.

Current Housing Stock and Trends

West Placer County:

- **Current Stock** – Between 1990 and 2001, the number of dwelling units in West Placer County increased by 12 percent (from 325 to 364 units), while the population increased by 14 percent during the same period. A breakdown of these dwelling types includes 79.1 percent single-family homes, 0.3 percent multi-family units and 20.6 percent mobile homes.
- **Housing Costs** – Home prices are not available in unincorporated West Placer County.
- **Residential Growth** – SACOG projects that between 2005 and 2025, the number of households in the West Placer RAD will increase by 6,066, representing an increase of 394 percent.

Roseville:

- **Current Stock** – Between 1990 and 2001, the City of Roseville’s dwelling units increased by 88 percent (from 17,639 to 33,239 units), while the population increased by 81 percent during the same period. A breakdown of these dwelling types includes 76.8 percent single-family homes, 21.2 percent multi-family units, and 1.9 percent mobile homes.
- **Housing Costs** – The April 2006 median home price in Roseville was \$380,000, which is a 2.4 percent increase from April 2005.
- **Residential Growth** – SACOG projects that between 2005 and 2025, the number of households in Roseville will increase by 8,505, representing an increase of 20 percent.

Lincoln:

- **Current Stock** – Between 1990 and 2001, the City of Lincoln’s dwelling units increased by 72 percent (from 3,673 to 6,304 units) and the population also increased by 72 percent during the same period. A breakdown of these dwelling types includes 81.3 percent single-family homes, 14.2 percent multi-family units, and 4.5 percent mobile homes.
- **Housing Costs** – The April 2006 median home price in Lincoln was \$440,000, which is a 6 percent increase from April 2005.
- **Residential Growth** – SACOG projects that between 2005 and 2025, the number of households in Lincoln will increase by 12,967, representing an increase of 99 percent.

Loomis:

- **Current Stock** – Between 1990 and 2001, the City of Loomis’s dwelling units increased by 17 percent (from 4,584 to 5,357 units) and the population also increased by 17 percent during the same period. A breakdown of these dwelling types includes 87.6 percent single-family homes, 6.4 percent multi-family units, and 6 percent mobile homes.
- **Housing Costs** – The April 2006 median home price in Loomis was \$665,000, which is a 66 percent increase from April 2004.
- **Residential Growth** – SACOG projects that between 2005 and 2025, the number of households in Loomis will increase by 4,255, representing an increase of 68 percent.

Rocklin:

- **Current Stock** – Between 1990 and 2001, the City of Rocklin’s dwelling units increased by 119 percent (from 6,704 to 14,695 units) while the population increased by 109 percent during the same period. A breakdown of these dwelling types includes 75.7 percent single-family homes, 21.2 percent multi-family units, and 3.1 percent mobile homes.
- **Housing Costs** – The April 2006 median home price in Rocklin was \$489,950. This is a 28 percent increase from April 2004.
- **Residential Growth** – SACOG projects that between 2005 and 2025, the number of households in Rocklin will increase by 7,914, representing an increase of 40 percent.

Vacancy Rate

Vacancy rates are one indicator of the adequacy of housing supply. According to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development, vacancy rates that fall below 5 percent are considered critical. Table 5-9 provides housing vacancy rates for cities near the Plan Area for 2000 and 2005. All showed a decrease in vacancy rates for 2005, except for the City of Lincoln, which experienced a slight increase.

**Table 5-9
Placer County Vacancy Rates**

City	Vacancy Rate (2000)	Vacancy Rate (2005)
West Placer	Not available	Not available
Roseville	6.7%	3.6%
Lincoln	3.4%	3.6%
Loomis	3.2%	2.9%
Rocklin	6.6%	3.7%

Source: State of California, Department of Finance, 2005

Availability of Residential Land to Meet Housing Needs

SACOG has projected a need for 57,881 dwelling units in unincorporated areas of Placer County between 2000 and 2007 to house the anticipated increase in population, which amounts to about 8,269 new units per year. As shown in Table 5-10, the bulk of this need for housing falls in the very low and above moderate income categories.

**Table 5-10
Projected Demand for New Housing in Placer County**

Income Category	Projected Total Need for 2007	New Units Needed to be Built 2000-2007	% of Total Need
Very low	12,037	2,264	26.2%
Low	9,036	1,801	20.8%
Moderate	11,711	1,797	20.8%
Above moderate	25,097	2,779	32.2%
Total	57,881	8,641	100%

Source: SACOG, 2001

Housing Affordability

An adequate balance between the availability of jobs and of housing affordable to workers filling those jobs is an important environmental consideration. A jobs-housing imbalance caused by lack of affordable housing results in lengthy commutes, which not only affects the social and economic conditions of a region but can result in traffic, noise, and air quality impacts as well.

The South Placer region remains relatively affordable as a source of housing when compared with the San Francisco Bay Area or Los Angeles metropolitan areas. However, as the region has continued to attract higher-paid commuters from Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay Area, demand for land and housing has increased housing prices. Housing is considered affordable when monthly housing costs do not

exceed 30 percent of a household's gross monthly income. According to the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey for Placer County (2003), 39 percent of owners with mortgages, 14 percent of owners without mortgages, and 42 percent of renters in Placer County spent 30 percent or more of their household income on housing.

Each year, the State of California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) provides county household income limits for each of the income categories shown below. These categories are established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and represent various percentages of a jurisdiction's median household income: 50 percent of median defines very low-income household and 80 percent of median defines low-income households. Income limits are used by the state and counties to calculate fair share housing needs and determine household eligibility for low-income housing subsidies. Table 5-11 shows the 2007 household income limits according to household size, based on Placer County's median income of \$67,200 for a household of four persons.

**Table 5-11
Household Income Limits (2007)**

Persons per Household	Very Low Income ¹	Lower Income ²	Median Income	Moderate Income ³
1	\$23,500	\$37,650	\$47,000	\$56,400
2	\$26,900	\$43,000	\$53,800	\$64,500
3	\$30,250	\$48,400	\$60,500	\$72,500
4	\$33,600	\$53,750	\$67,200	\$80,600
5	\$36,300	\$58,050	\$72,600	\$87,000
6	\$39,000	\$62,350	\$78,000	\$93,500
7	\$41,650	\$66,650	\$83,300	\$99,900
8	\$44,350	\$70,950	\$88,700	\$106,400

Source: State of California HCD, 2007

Notes:

¹ Households earning 50 percent or less of County median income

² Households earning 51-80 percent of County median income

³ Households earning 81-120 percent of County median Income

Using the information from Table 5-11, calculations were made to produce maximum monthly housing costs 2007 using California's 30 percent rule. These maximum monthly housing costs are shown in Table 5-12. The 2007 monthly costs in this table reflect a 5 percent increase from 2006 costs.

**Table 5-12
Maximum Monthly Housing Costs (2007)**

Persons per Household	Very Low Income ¹	Lower Income ²	Median Income	Moderate Income ³
1	\$588	\$941	\$1,175	\$1,410
2	\$673	\$1,075	\$1,345	\$1,613
3	\$756	\$1,210	\$1,513	\$1,813
4	\$840	\$1,344	\$1,680	\$2,015
5	\$908	\$1,451	\$1,815	\$2,175
6	\$975	\$1,559	\$1,950	\$2,338
7	\$1,041	\$1,666	\$2,083	\$2,498
8	\$1,109	\$1,774	\$2,218	\$2,660

5.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.2.1 Federal and State Regulations

There are no specific federal or state regulations about population, employment, or housing that address impacts associated with the proposed project.

5.2.2 Local Regulations

The *Placer County General Plan* (General Plan) contains policies governing development within Placer County, and the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* (Community Plan) has policies regarding development within the Community Plan area. Goals and policies applicable to population, employment, and housing are identified below. The proposed project's consistency with these plans and policies is evaluated in Appendix D. Both plans anticipate that growth would occur in the Dry Creek vicinity. Goals and policies applicable to the proposed project are outlined in the following subsections.

Placer County General Plan

Job-Housing Balance

Goal 1.M To work toward a jobs-housing balance.

Policy 1.M.1 The County shall concentrate most new growth within existing communities emphasizing infill development, intensified use of existing development, and expanded services so individual communities become more complete, diverse, and balanced.

Affordable Housing Supply

Goal A: To provide a continuing supply of affordable housing to meet the needs of existing and future Placer County residents in all income categories.

Policy A.1 The County shall adopt programs and procedures with the intent of achieving its fair share regional housing allocation.

Policy A.8 The County shall evaluate the adoption of an inclusionary housing ordinance as a means of integrating affordable units within new residential development. This ordinance will identify acceptable methods to provide affordable housing, which will include the following:

- a. Construction of housing on site.
- b. Construction of housing off site.
- c. Dedication of land for housing.
- d. Payment of an in-lieu fee.

Policy A.9 Housing for low-income households that is required in a new residential project shall be dispersed throughout the project, to the extent practical, given the size of the project and other site constraints.

Energy Conservation

Policy G.1. All new dwelling units shall be required to meet current State requirements for energy efficiency. Retrofitting of existing units shall be encouraged.

Placer County's Affordable Housing Guidelines For Specific Plan Content

Placer County also has Guidelines for addressing affordable housing needs in proposed specific plans.

1. Affordable Housing Allocation – At least 10 percent of all residential units proposed, except as provided for herein, shall be set aside as affordable housing units. The distribution shall be 4 percent very low, 4 percent low and 2 percent moderate (as defined by the State of California, Department of HCD). A table with a break down of units shall be included. Mixed-Use units (CMU or MU) are not required to be included in the affordable housing calculation. Faculty/staff housing and retirement housing shall be included in the affordable housing calculation.
2. Affordable Housing Sites – The location of the proposed affordable housing shall be described and shown within each specific plan. In addition, the developers shall identify and disclose specific sites for affordable housing units at the time of subdivision.
3. Language – Language and terminology consistent with HCD convention shall be used throughout the affordable housing discussion. Affordability criteria shall be those as set forth by HCD.
4. Affordability Timeframe – Units shall be affordable for 30 years for ownership units and 55 years for rental units, or as required otherwise by financing.

The following issues should be generally discussed within each specific plan, with more specific details anticipated in the project development agreement:

1. Density Bonus – A general discussion of anticipated density bonus requests shall be provided; however, additional requirements for approval of a density bonus may be described in the project development agreement.
2. Implementation – Each specific plan is responsible for building the required affordable housing units as shown within the specific plan boundaries. Options such as land dedication, credits/transfers, and in-lieu fees, in lieu of building affordable housing units, will only be considered in the project development agreement. The project development agreement may consider credit/transfers provided that the credit or transfer enhances the ability to construct affordable units. A lottery system shall be established for sale of affordable units, and conducted by the County or a neutral party at a public meeting.
3. Resale Controls – Shared Appreciation in high housing cost areas such as Placer County, should be tied to the increase in Area Median Income. Resale of affordable units should set a resale price based on the increase in Area Median Income or use land trusts.
4. Timing for Construction – Affordable units shall be developed concurrent with market rate units or upon established triggers for construction as set forth in the development agreement.

Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan

Community Development: Population and Housing

Goal: Provide sound and adequate housing to all residents at desirable locations including consideration of transportation facilities, school facilities and proximity to major employment centers.

- Policy 1: Encourage residential development in areas which provide an adequate and accessible transportation network and which reduce commuting distances to areas of employment.
- Policy 3: Residential areas should be located where a full range of services and facilities can be provided most efficiently and economically.
- Goal: Provide housing to meet future needs anticipated in current population projections for all economic segments anticipated within the plan area while ensuring consistency with existing land uses.
- Policy 1: Encourage innovative development techniques to assure a wide diversification of housing types.
- Policy 2: Limit high and medium density residential development to areas which have available public services and are compatible with surrounding land uses
- Goal: Provide safe, innovative and energy efficient residential developments.
- Policy 2: Encourage developments which create a sense of community by fostering human interaction through subdivision design, pathways, interconnecting trail systems, in-tract recreation opportunities, etc.
- Policy 4: The design of future residential developments should emphasize character, quality, livability and the provision of all necessary services and facilities to insure their permanent attractiveness.
- Policy 5: Encourage neighborhood design which fosters pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian traffic while still providing for safe automotive circulation.

Community Development Land Use

- Policy 8: Residential areas should be located where a full range of services and facilities can be provided most efficiently and economically.
- Policy 12: Where appropriate, higher-density housing (i.e., Sabre City) should be provided in sufficient quantity to meet Housing Element goals while retaining and preserving existing single-family residential neighborhoods.
- Policy 13: Ensure that the recommendations of the Housing Element are reflected in the Land Use Plan.

Placer County also provides guidance on affordable housing in its Affordable Housing Guidelines for Specific Plan Content. The document contains guidelines that 10 percent of all new home construction in the County be affordable.

The 1990 *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* provides for a reasonable mix of housing types to address its goals and the County's General Plan. It states a preference for single-family homes and contains a brief section about affordable housing policies adopted by the County. At the same time, the Community Plan may be somewhat out of date. For example, it states that the South Placer Policy Committee's position to locate high-density affordable housing would be in incorporated cities because unincorporated areas would not have the necessary infrastructure to support higher densities. Given the recent, burgeoning development in south Placer County, it is more likely that infrastructure needs and public services are being developed or are planned for the unincorporated parts of this area.

5.3 IMPACTS

This section identifies and discusses the impacts to population, employment, and housing resulting from the proposed project, and suggests mitigation measures to reduce the levels of impact. A detailed discussion of mitigation measures is included in Section 5.4.

5.3.1 Significance Criteria

Impacts associated with population, employment, and housing would be significant if they would:

- Induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly, in an area not planned for such growth;
- Displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or
- Conflict with Placer County's affordable housing policies and objectives.

5.3.2 Project-Level Impacts

Population

IMPACT 5-1:	Increase the population of unincorporated Placer County
SIGNIFICANCE:	Less than Significant
MITIGATION:	None Warranted

Using the County's estimating factors, the projected population of the proposed Plan Area at buildout would be 2,477 residents, as shown on Table 5-13. (This includes both the project- and program-level parcels.)

Placer County's General Plan anticipates growth within its jurisdiction, including the unincorporated area. The *Placer County Countywide General Plan Final EIR* (Placer County, 2004b) states that "the General Plan will accommodate a significant increase in the [unincorporated] population, especially in the South Placer regional analysis area."

The *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* does not specify a number of residential dwelling units within the Plan Area. An estimate of unit counts allowable under the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* was calculated based upon application of Community Plan lot size and density provisions (MacKay & Soms, 2006). This estimate assumes that 650 low- or medium-density residential dwelling units are allowable on the proposed Plan Area. Using the County's estimating factor of 2.7 persons for each dwelling unit, this Community Plan would result in a population increase of about 1,755 persons. This is 722 persons less than the project- and program-level calculation of 2,477 new residents.

The population increase, compared to estimated 2005 population levels in Placer County, is less than one-half of one percent more than planned for this area. This would not be an introduction of substantial new population, and the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on population growth. At the same time, the estimated population increase could have indirect impacts to traffic, air quality, noise, etc. These potential indirect impacts are addressed in their respective chapters of this Draft EIR.

Table 5-13
Estimated Population by Household Type

Household Type	Estimated Number of Dwelling Units	Estimated Number of Persons by Household ¹	Estimated Number of Residents
Project-Level Parcels			
Low-Density	378	2.7	1,021
Medium-Density	157	2.7	424
High-Density	60	2.0	120
Rural Agricultural	2	2.7	5
Agricultural-10	6	2.7	16
Program-Level Parcels			
Frisvold – Medium-Density	120	2.7	324
Elliott – Low-Density	170	2.7	459
Lund – Low-Density	40	2.7	108
Total	933		2,477

Source: Kemper2007

Notes:

¹County's estimating factors include the following:

- 2.7 persons per household for low-density residences
- 2.7 persons per household for medium-density residences
- 2.0 persons per household for high -density residences

IMPACT 5-2: Exceed regional population projections
SIGNIFICANCE: Less than Significant
MITIGATION: None Warranted

SACOG produces regional population projections for the area in which the proposed project is located. Using numbers from the region's General Plans, including Placer County, SACOG estimates that there will be a population increase of 535,020 people in the greater Sacramento region by 2025. The estimated 2,477 residents of the proposed Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan constitute 0.5 percent of SACOG's anticipated increase of 535,020 new residents in the region.

SACOG also forecasts that a mix of development would occur in the southwestern portion of Placer County, which would primarily consist of residential development. In its "Blueprint, Preferred Scenario Map" for the proposed project area (available at http://www.sacregionblueprint.org/sacregionblueprint/the_project/maps/counties/placer/southwest/scenariomap.html), SACOG envisions a mix of high-density residential and attached residential dwelling units. While the proposed project would develop at lower intensities than SACOG's Blueprint Preferred Scenario, SACOG's growth projections are based upon the County's current General Plan buildout assumptions, which for the proposed Plan Area primarily consist of low-density residential and open space uses. As a result, a portion of the development within the proposed Specific Plan (650 units) has already been accounted for in SACOG's projections.

Given that the proposed project's population growth and development densities would not exceed regional population projections, the effect of population growth resulting from the implementation of the proposed project is considered less than significant.



Employment

The proposed project would provide employment for local and regional residents during construction. When developed, the commercial parcel is estimated to produce about 176 jobs at buildout. While this is a nominal amount, an increase in employment opportunities would be considered beneficial to the economy of the region. The infusion of new residents' income into local businesses could, in addition, generate induced employment opportunities as well as increase the labor pool for employers to draw from. The proposed project would therefore have a beneficial effect with respect to employment in Placer County.



Housing

IMPACT 5-3:	Development of project level parcels would increase the demand/need for affordable housing
SIGNIFICANCE:	Potentially Significant
MITIGATION:	Mitigation Measure 5-3a
Proposed:	Mitigation Measure 5-3a
Significance After Proposed Mitigation:	Less than Significant
Recommended:	None
RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE:	Less than Significant

If the project-level parcels (those owned or controlled by the Applicant) were to fulfill the County's guidelines 10 percent guidance for affordable housing (4 percent of residential units allocated to very low income households, 4 percent of residential units allocated to low income households, and 2 percent of residential units allocated to moderate income households), it would have to reserve 60 of its 597 units for affordable housing, as summarized in Table 5-14. (The actual number would depend on the number of dwelling units constructed by the Applicant.)

To meet this requirement, the Applicant has set aside 60 units in affordable housing for the southwestern parcel of the proposed Plan Area, which is identified in the Specific Plan as high-density residential uses. This is further broken down as follows: 24 units for very low-income households; 24 units for low-income households; and 12 units for moderate-income households. Since individual developers have not been identified for these uses, a mitigation measure is identified that requires the County to confirm that the required numbers of units are included in development plans. The eventual number of affordable units to be developed may fluctuate based upon the total number of units approved by the County and developed by the Applicant, in adherence to the 10 percent requirement. With this mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**Table 5-14
Placer County Affordable Housing Obligations for Project-Level Parcels**

Income Category	Required Allocation (as Percentage of Total Units to be Built)	Number of Affordable Units Required (based on proposed 597 units)
Very low income	4%	24
Low income	4%	24
Moderate income	2%	12
Total	10%	60

Although CEQA case law has held that a project’s tendency to increase the demand for affordable housing is not an environmental effect, but rather is an economic or social effect outside the purview of CEQA (see *San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth v. City and County of San Francisco* [1988] 209 Cal.App.3d 1502, 1521-1522, fn. 13), the previous discussion is nevertheless included herein in order to provide the public and County decision-makers with information relevant to consideration of the proposed project.

IMPACT 5-4: Displacement of existing dwelling units on project-level parcels
SIGNIFICANCE: Significant
MITIGATION: Mitigation Measure 5-4a
Proposed: Mitigation Measure 5-4a
Significance After Proposed Mitigation: Less than Significant
Recommended: None
RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE: Less than Significant

Two existing dwelling units on parcels owned or controlled by the Applicant would be removed. These dwelling units are located on APNs 023-200-055 and 023-200-023. The Applicant has purchased these parcels, and the previous landowners have been compensated. The one remaining existing structure on land controlled by the Applicant would be preserved because it is land that would be designated as Rural Residential. This would allow for the structure’s continued existence.

One residential home west of Watt Avenue could be displaced due to construction activities associated with Watt Avenue improvements. This would be a potentially significant impact. The proposed project would contribute to the cost of this regional improvement, including relocation costs. With this mitigation, impacts of displacement would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

5.3.3 Program-Level Impacts

Except as described below, program-level impacts are included in the discussion of project-level impacts. Applicants for program-level parcels would need to undergo the County’s Subsequent Conformity Review Process to ensure that their development proposals conform to the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan, CEQA regulations, and program-level mitigation measures identified in this Draft EIR. Upon conclusion of the Subsequent Conformity Review Process, the County will determine whether the proposed development entitlement is consistent with the Specific Plan, whether additional environmental review is required, and if so, the scope of such additional review.

IMPACT 5-5: Development of program-level parcels would increase the demand/need for affordable housing
SIGNIFICANCE: Potentially Significant
MITIGATION: Mitigation Measure 5-5a
Proposed: Mitigation Measure 5-5a
Significance After Proposed Mitigation: Less than Significant
Recommended: None
RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE: Less than Significant

The 10 percent affordable housing requirement would be required with development of the parcels currently owned by Elliott, Frisvold, and Lund (APNs 023-221-005, 023-200-057, and 023-221-004, respectively). An estimate has been made in this Draft EIR regarding the number of dwelling units that could be proposed on these parcels. In the future, proposed dwelling units could be different from these estimates. Based on the estimates, Table 5-15 identifies the affordable housing obligations for these parcels.

**Table 5-15
 Affordable Housing Obligations for Program-Level Parcels**

Income Category	Required Allocation (Percentage of Total Units)	Number of Affordable Units Required for Elliott Property	Number of Affordable Units Required for Frisvold Property	Number of Affordable Units Required for Lund Property
Very low income	4%	7	5	2
Low income	4%	7	5	2
Moderate income	2%	3	2	0
Total	10%	17	12	4

Since individual developers have not been identified for these uses, a mitigation measure is identified that requires the County to confirm that the required numbers of units are included in development plans. With this mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

While CEQA does not require that the induced need for affordable housing be addressed, the County has determined that affordable housing is an important issue that should be identified and analyzed in this environmental document.

IMPACT 5-6: Displacement of existing dwelling units on program-level parcels
SIGNIFICANCE: Potentially Significant
MITIGATION: Mitigation Measure 5-6a
Proposed: None
Significance After Proposed Mitigation: Potentially Significant
Recommended: Mitigation Measure 5-6a
RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANCE: Less than Significant

There are residences on four of the program-level parcels (Elliott [APN 023-221-005], Frisvold [APN 023-200-057], Lund [APN 023-221-004], and Singh [APN 023-200-019]). If future development projects would impact existing residences on program-level parcels, the applicant for the proposed development would

need to compensate the owner of the existing residences. Implementation of this mitigation, if required, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

5.4 MITIGATION MEASURES

This section discusses mitigation measures that will be implemented to reduce project-related impacts to housing. Mitigation measures are separately identified as those “Proposed” by the Applicant and those “Recommended” by County staff.

Mitigation Measure 5-3a: Comply with Placer County’s 10 percent requirement for affordable housing on project-level parcels (Proposed)

The County shall ensure that the affordable housing units proposed by the Applicant are allocated to meet the overall requirement for affordable housing as identified in its guidance for all Specified Plans, which requires 10 percent of new developments to be reserved for affordable housing, or 4 percent of the units for very-low income households, 4 percent of the units for low-income households, and 2 percent of the units for moderate-income households.

Mitigation Measure 5-4a: Contribute a fair share to compensation/relocation assistance associated with Watt Avenue improvements (Proposed)

Compensation for property acquisition and relocation assistance shall be provided to the persons living in the residence that would be displaced west of Watt Avenue. The Watt Avenue improvements are regional improvements, for which the proposed project will contribute a fair share to the cost. The responsibility for relocation of the residents is a shared responsibility, which will likely be coordinated by the County through the acquisition process for this site, if required as a result of the alignment of Watt Avenue.

Mitigation Measure 5-5a: Comply with Placer County’s 10 percent requirement for affordable housing on program-level parcels (Proposed)

The County shall ensure that the affordable housing units proposed by future residential development on parcels currently owned by Elliott (APN 023-221-005), Frisvold (APN 23-200-057) and Lund (APN 023-221-004) allocate 10 percent of the dwelling units to affordable housing. Affordable housing shall meet the Affordable Housing Compact goals of 4 percent of the units for very-low income households, 4 percent of the units for low-income households, and 2 percent of the units for moderate-income households.

Mitigation Measure 5-6a: Contribute a fair share to compensation/relocation assistance on program-level parcels, if required (Recommended)

Compensation for property acquisition and relocation assistance shall be provided for displaced residents on program-level parcels. The relocation of the residents would be the responsibility of the developing entity and coordinated by the County.