CHAPTER 5.0

POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

The purpose of this section is to evaluate the changes to population, employment, and housing associated with the proposed project. The existing setting will be discussed followed by project-related impacts and associated mitigation measures.

5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

5.1.1 POPULATION

PLACER COUNTY

Placer County had an estimated population of 316,508 in 2006 (**Table 5-1**). Approximately 34 percent of the population resides in the unincorporated areas of the County. Roseville is the largest city in the County with an estimated population of 104,655 people (33 percent of the County population). Rocklin has the second largest population in the County (16 percent), followed by Lincoln (10 percent), Auburn (4 percent), Loomis (2 percent) and Colfax (1 percent). According to the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), Placer County had the highest population growth rate in the Sacramento Region (El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Yolo, Yuba, Sutter counties) from 1996 to 2006, increasing by 47 percent during this time period (SACOG, 2007). Population trends in Placer County have ranked the County second among all counties in the State for growth between 2002 and 2003, 2003 and 2004, and 2004 and 2005 (Sacramento Regional Research Institute [SRRI], 2007; California Department of Finance, 2006). Comparatively, population growth for Placer County was larger than the Bay Area, and the State of California as a whole.

TABLE 5-1
PLACER COUNTY POPULATION

	2000*	2006**
Placer County	**248,399**	**316,508**
Auburn	12,462	12,975
Colfax	1,496	1,825
Lincoln	11,205	33,589
Loomis	6,260	6,480
Rocklin	36,330	50,920
Roseville	79,921	104,655
Unincorporated Area	100,725	106,064

Source: *U.S. Census Bureau, 2000;
**SRRI, 2007

As shown in **Table 5-2**, projections indicate that the population in Placer County is expected to increase by approximately 60 percent between 2000 and 2020. The City of Lincoln is expected to have the greatest growth rate in Placer County from 2000 to 2020, with a 405 percent increase over the City's 2000 population.

TABLE 5-2
PLACER COUNTY POPULATION PROJECTIONS

	2000*	2010 (Projected)**	2020 (Projected)**	Percent Change 2000-2020
Placer County	**248,399**	**336,805**	**396,785**	**59.7%**
Auburn	12,462	14,090	16,240	30.3%
Colfax	1,496	2,065	2,670	78.5%
Lincoln	11,205	38,350	56,575	404.9%
Loomis	6,260	8,400	9,830	57.0%
Rocklin	36,330	50,700	64,870	78.6%
Roseville	79,921	109,160	109,360	36.8%
Unincorporated Area	100,725	114,040	137,240	36.3%

Source: *U.S. Census, 2000;
**SRRI, 2004

5.1.2 EMPLOYMENT

PLACER COUNTY

Economic growth has steadily climbed in Placer County over the past few years, with a large percentage of growth in the fields of sales and large industry. Placer County has welcomed many large companies to the area bringing thousands of new jobs to the region. In 2006, the County approved entitlements permitting approximately 430,000 square feet of new commercial, industrial, and office building development within the Sunset Industrial Area (SIA). **Table 5-3** shows several of the largest employers in Placer County in 2006, including the Hewlett-Packard Corporation (4,000 employees), Thunder Valley Casino (2,020 employees), Kaiser Permanente (1,980 employees) and Raley's (1,251 employees) (SRRI, 2007; Crowe, 2007a).

As of May 2007, the total civilian workforce for Placer County included 171,800 individuals with 164,200 employed and 7,600 unemployed (California Employment Development Department (EDD), 2007). This 4.6 percent unemployment rate is slightly lower than the State average of 4.9 percent (EDD, 2007). The County unemployment rate is also lower than the current national average, which was 4 percent in 2000 and 4.7 percent as of May 2007 (U.S. Department of Labor, 2007).

TABLE 5-3
LARGEST PRIVATE SECTOR EMPLOYERS- PLACER COUNTY

Company	Industry	Number of Local Employees
Hewlett-Packard	Computer Hardware Manufacturing	4,000
Thunder Valley Casino	Casinos	2,020
Kaiser Permanente	Healthcare	1,980
Raley's Inc.	Retail Groceries	1,251
Squaw Valley Ski Corp.	Misc. Amusement, Rec. Services	*1,200
Union Pacific Railroad Co. Inc.	Transportation, Railroad	1,100
Wal-Mart Stores Inc.	Retail Merchandise	1,053
PRIDE Industries Inc.	Manufacturing & Logistics Services	1,050
NEC Industries Inc.	Electronic Components and Accessories	1,000
Sutter Health	Healthcare	985
Wells Fargo & Co.	Financial Services	632
Pacific Gas and Electric Co.	Utility Distributor	624
Target Corp.	Retail Merchandise	604
SureWest Communications	Telecommunications Services	574
Resort at Squaw Creek	Misc., Amusement, Rec. Services	*560
United Natural Foods Inc.	Wholesale Groceries	478
United Parcel Service	Shipping	356
Sierra Pacific Industries	Sawmills & Planing Mills	320
Coherent Inc.	Electronic Components & Accessories	219

Source: SRRI, 2007
*Includes seasonal workers

As shown in **Table 5-4,** there were approximately 932,100 jobs during 2005 in the Sacramento region, which includes El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties. Approximately 138,600 of these jobs were in Placer County. The number of jobs in Placer County is projected to increase by 10 percent from 2005 to 2010 and an additional 11 percent from 2010 to 2015. By comparison, the number of jobs in the Sacramento Region is projected to increase by 8 percent from 2005 to 2010, and an additional 9.4 percent from 2010 to 2015.

TABLE 5-4
REGIONAL NUMBER OF JOBS

Location	2005	2010	2015
Placer County	138,600	153,000	170,700
Sacramento Region	932,100	1,012,200	1,116,200

Source: SRRI, 2007

Table 5-5 shows typical wages and salaries for private sector jobs in the Sacramento Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area, which includes El Dorado, Sacramento and Placer counties.

TABLE 5-5
REGIONAL PRIVATE SECTOR WAGES-1ST QUARTER 2006

Occupational Category	Mean Annual Wage
Management	$89,759
Legal	$86,031
Architecture and Engineering	$71,957
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	$70,231
Computer and Mathematical	$68,043
Life, Physical and Social Science	$59,412
Business and Financial Operations	$57,256
Education, Training, and Library	$47,714
Community and Social Services	$44,601
Construction and Extraction	$44,214
Protective Service	$43,067
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, and Media	$41,742
Installation, Maintenance, and Repair	$40,949
Sales and Related	$35,620
Office and Administrative Support	$33,867
Production	$30,895
Transportation and Material Moving	$29,603
Healthcare Support	$27,264
Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	$23,926
Farming, Fishing, and Forestry	$23,524
Personal Care and Service	$23,015
Food Preparation and Serving-Related	$19,074

Source: SRRI, 2007

THUNDER VALLEY CASINO

As of June 2007, Thunder Valley Casino was the second largest employer in Placer County with 2,280 employees, earning an average annual salary of $50,511 (Crowe, 2007a; 2007b). A breakdown of existing jobs and number of employees is provided in **Table 5-6**. Of the 2,280 employees at the casino, approximately 45 percent work at jobs related to gaming and 28 percent work at jobs related to food and beverage. Of these current employees, approximately 735 individuals (33 percent) are residents of Placer County. Thunder Valley Casino is also a major indirect contributor to the greater Sacramento Valley Area economy, with annual service contracts and purchases totaling nearly $48 million (Crowe, 2007b).

TABLE 5-6
THUNDER VALLEY CASINO EXISTING EMPLOYEES

Job Type	Number of Employees
Gaming	1,037
Food and Beverage	643
Other	99
Admin	107
Marketing	141
Maintenance	140
Security	114
Total	2,280

Source: Crowe, 2007a

5.1.3 HOUSING

PLACER COUNTY

Placer County's population growth has been accommodated by similar growth in the number of housing units. **Table 5-7** summarizes existing housing units (combined total of single family, multi-family, and mobile homes), along with future estimates for Placer County and the Sacramento Region. From 2000 to 2007, the number of housing units in Placer County increased by an average rate of 34.4 percent from 107,302 to 144,207 (SACOG, 2007). The existing number of housing units in Placer County is expected to increase from 144,207 to 217,836 by 2035, which represents a growth rate of 51 percent. Housing vacancy rates in Placer County decreased by 3 percent (from 13.9 percent to 10.9 percent) from 2000 to 2006, while the overall vacancy rate in California increased by 0.1 percent (5.8 percent to 5.9 percent) during the same time period (California Department of Finance, 2007).

TABLE 5-7
REGIONAL HOUSING UNITS

Location	2000	2007	2035*
Placer County	107,302	144,207	217,836
Roseville	31,925	44,187	80,603
Lincoln	4,146	16,632	34,202
Rocklin	14,421	20,366	28,629
Sacramento Region	765,936	903,731	1,230,830

Source: SACOG, 2007
* SACOG Travel Run Model for Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2035

In September 2007, the median price of a home in California was $530,830 (California Association of Realtors, 2007). **Table 5-8** provides the median prices for homes within Placer County for 1996 and 2006. In 1996, the median home price for Placer County was $170,000. The median home price for Placer County in 2006 was $430,000, which represents an increase of approximately 253 percent.

TABLE 5-8
MEDIAN HOME PRICES

Location	1996	2006	% Change 1996-2006
Placer County	$170,000	$430,000	253%
Auburn	$148,000	$419,500	283%
Lincoln	$120,000	$427,250	356%
Rocklin	$160,000	$445,500	278%
Roseville	$181,000	$400,472	221%

Source: SRRI, 2007; California Association of Realtors, 2007

Placer County monthly rental rates from the U.S. Census Bureau are provided in **Table 5-9**. The majority of the rental units in Placer County (approximately 39 percent) rent for $1,000 to $1,499 per month, followed by approximately 28 percent that rent for $750 to $999 per month. The median rent in Placer County is $1,053 per month.

TABLE 5-9
GROSS RENT IN PLACER COUNTY

Gross Rent	Estimated Units	Percentage of Total
Less than $200	61	0.18%
$200 to $299	679	1.99%
$300 to $499	883	2.59%
$500 to $749	3,475	10.20%
$750 to $999	9,530	27.98%
$1,000 to $1,499	13,420	39.40%
$1,500 or more	4,737	13.91%
No cash rent	1,277	3.75%
Total	**34,062**	
Median rent	$1,053	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006

Table 5-10 provides the gross rent as a percentage of household income in Placer County. According the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the maximum amount of a household's monthly income that should be paid toward rent including utilities is 30 percent (Placer County, 2003). Approximately 51 percent of Placer County households spend 30 percent or more of their monthly income on rent (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006).

TABLE 5-10
GROSS RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN PLACER COUNTY

Percentage of Household Income	Estimated Number of Households	Percentage of Households
Less than 15.0%	3,349	9.83%
15.0 to 19%	3,274	9.61%
20.0 to 24.9%	3,956	11.61%
25.0 to 29.9%	4,835	14.19%
30.0 to 34.9%	3,142	9.22%
35.0% or more	14,182	41.64%
Not computed	1,324	3.89%
Total	**34,062**	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006

5.2 REGULATORY SETTING

This section describes regulations and policies that have been adopted to address population growth, jobs, and housing development. The primary regulatory instrument is the Placer County General Plan (1994) and its associated Housing Element. The SIA Plan provides additional guidelines in the vicinity of the proposed project. In addition, state law requires that jurisdictions provide their fair share of regional housing needs. Applicable state and local policies are discussed below. There are no federal housing regulations that are applicable to the proposed project.

5.2.1 PLACER COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

The Land Use Element and the Housing Element of the Placer County General Plan include policies that guide population and housing growth within County jurisdiction.

LAND USE ELEMENT

The Land Use Element designates the general location and intensity of housing, business, industry, open space, education, public facilities, waste disposal facilities, and other land uses. The policies that are applicable to the proposed project are presented in **Table 4-2** of **Chapter 4.0**.

HOUSING ELEMENT

The General Plan Housing Element (2003) provides a comprehensive assessment of current and projected housing needs for all economic segments of the community. It sets forth local housing policies and programs to implement those policies. Pursuant to §65588 of the California Government Code, political subdivisions of the State of California must update their general plan housing elements as often as necessary, but no less than every five years. The reason for this requirement is that the State has

determined that the availability of housing is of vital statewide importance and the attainment of decent affordable housing for every Californian is of the highest order (Government Code §65580). The existing Housing Element of the Placer County General Plan states that the County has a total current housing construction need of 57,881 units. It also states that the County will be able to accommodate its very low, low, and moderate-income households based on land currently available in various zoning districts and that the County will continue to set proper objectives towards growth (Placer County, 2003). Programs related to issuing density bonuses, fee waivers, and increasing mixed-use development will lead to a positive and stable housing market, in which there is no constraint to meeting overall future housing construction needs (Placer County, 2003).

The General Plan Housing Element contains goals, policies, and quantified objectives for the provision of housing for people of all income levels. The goals and policies relevant to the proposed project are presented in **Table 4-2** of **Chapter 4.0**.

5.2.2 SUNSET INDUSTRIAL AREA PLAN

The SIA Plan contains goals and policies which address continued growth of industry and commercial businesses, and issues related to noise, safety, economic development, cultural resources, transportation, and public services. Goals and policies include keeping a balance between employment and housing, the latter of which has swelled in the region in the past decade. The goals and policies relevant to the proposed project are presented in **Table 4-3** of **Chapter 4.0**.

The Placer County Redevelopment Agency's Sunset Industrial Redevelopment Project Area Five-Year Implementation Plan (2007-2012) outlines the following additional goals related to population, employment and housing for the SIA Redevelopment Project Area, which includes the project site (**Figure 4-6**):

- Creation and development of local job opportunities in order to preserve and expand the SIA Redevelopment Project Area's employment base.

- Provision of financial assistance for the preservation and development of affordable housing in areas outside the SIA Redevelopment Project Area.

With no standard housing policy, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency is required by the California Health and Safety Code §3334.2 to create a "housing set-aside fund." The Redevelopment Agency must set aside no less than 20 percent of the gross property tax increment that is generated within its designated borders into this fund. The fund will be used to produce low to moderate-income housing within Placer County near the SIA Redevelopment Project Area, primarily within the communities of Lincoln, Rocklin, Roseville, and Sheridan (Placer County Redevelopment Agency, 2007b). Redevelopment areas in the State of California are mandated to create low-income housing, but since the SIA is not currently zoned

for housing, the fund will be used for the rehabilitation and development of affordable housing. From 2001 to 2006, the SIA generated tax increment revenue set-aside for housing in this amount of $1,038,572. The fund is estimated to generate $2,366,058 during Fiscal Year 2006-2007 and the next five years (Placer County Redevelopment Agency, 2007a).

5.2.3 REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS PLAN

State law requires that jurisdictions provide their fair share of regional housing needs. The State of California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is mandated to determine the statewide housing need. In cooperation with HCD, local governments and councils of governments are charged with making a determination of the existing and projected housing need as a share of the state-wide housing need of their city or region. Under this direction, SACOG has developed the Regional Housing Needs Plan (RHNP) for the SACOG Region, which encompasses a six-county area. The RHNP allocates to cities and counties their "fair share" of the region's projected housing needs by household income group over the five-year planning period of each jurisdiction's housing element. Local housing needs may exceed this determination of a locality's regional fair share. SACOG has estimated the minimum regional need for housing, versus the maximum amount of housing to be built in a community. The Plan itself covers a seven and a half year period. The RHNP also identifies existing housing needs for each jurisdiction. The current RHNP was completed in 2006 and addresses housing needs to 2013. The RHNP identifies that Placer County should have a total of 173,317 additional units at the year 2013. As discussed previously, the SACOG has estimated that there were approximately 131,818 units in Placer County at the beginning of 2006 (2007).

5.3 IMPACTS

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

An impact to population, housing and employment from the proposed project would be considered significant if implementation would:

- Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure),
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing and/or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, or
- Create an imbalance in affordable housing with an increase in employees.

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION IMPACTS

IMPACT 5.1: Development of the proposed project could induce substantial offsite population growth

SIGNIFICANCE: Less than Significant

MITIGATION: None Warranted

Construction of the proposed project would generate a temporary increase in demand for approximately 1,000 construction workers during the peak construction period (Crowe, 2007b). According to 2005 labor data, 17,851 residents in Placer County are employed in the construction industry (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005). Thousands of construction workers are also employed in contiguous Sacramento County. Construction jobs are therefore expected to be filled by the existing labor pool in the area and are not anticipated to contribute to population growth or increased housing demand. Additionally, because the construction period is estimated to be approximately 24 months, some workers could choose to commute to the project site rather than temporarily relocate to the area.

Operation and maintenance of the proposed project would create approximately 1,202 jobs (**Table 5-11**). Given the current number of casino workers living in Placer County (33%) and the availability of labor in the regional work force, it is expected that there would be minimal migration into Placer County. While the jobs/housing ratio can be expected to increase marginally in the short term, the increase would not be significant. Any new workers moving to the area could be accommodated by the current stock of vacant housing in the area. Additionally, it can be assumed that the development of any additional housing within Placer County would be subject to approval by County land use plans and ordinances. The County would determine the consistency of proposed housing development with the goals and policies of the Placer County General Plan. Therefore, the proposed casino expansion would not induce substantial offsite population growth or new housing within Placer County either directly or indirectly.

TABLE 5-11
THUNDER VALLEY CASINO EXISTING + PROPOSED EMPLOYEES

Job Type	Existing Employees	Proposed Project Additions	Proposed Total Employees
Gaming	1,037	325	1,362
Hotel	--	197	197
Food and Beverage	643	455	1,098
Other	99	26	125
Entertainment	--	28	28
Admin	107	12	119
Marketing	141	25	166
Maintenance	140	78	218
Security	114	56	170
Total	2,280	1,202	3,482

Source: Crowe, 2007a

IMPACT 5.2:	Development of the proposed project could create an imbalance in affordable housing, with an increase in employees.
SIGNIFICANCE:	Less than Significant
MITIGATION:	None Warranted

The average employee compensation at Thunder Valley Casino is expected to increase as a result of the proposed project, from $50,511 to $53,875 annually (Crowe, 2007b). This is higher than the per capita income for Placer County which was $38,958 in 2004 and is projected to be $44,391 in 2010 (SRRI, 2007). The median rent for Placer County is $1,053 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006), which is considered affordable at the level of compensation provided by the proposed project. In addition, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency housing set-aside fund will be used to construct low to moderate-income housing within Placer County near the SIA Redevelopment Project Area and the proposed project site (Placer County Redevelopment Agency, 2007b). This impact is considered less than significant.

5.4 MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are warranted.