5.0 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

This section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR"; "Draft EIR") analyzes the potential impacts of the proposed Project on local population, housing, and employment characteristics. It characterizes the area's current population and housing stock; assesses recent changes to the area's population, employment, and housing; and identifies the proposed Project's impacts on the area's population, housing stock, and employment. Mitigation measures are provided as appropriate to mitigate for significant Project impacts.

5.1 EXISTING SETTING

5.1.1 Current Population and Growth Trends

Placer County is located in northern California at the base of the Sierra Nevada range. The county encompasses six incorporated cities and towns: Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Roseville, Rocklin, and Loomis. The county's 2009 population was estimated at 339,577, with about 32.5 percent residing in the unincorporated county and the remaining 67.5 percent residing in the county's incorporated cities. The county's 2030 population is projected to be about 512,509 with an average projected growth rate of 3.4 percent between 2000 and 2030 (DOF, 2007b). However, due to the current declines in the housing market and the economy as a whole, these projections may currently be overstated.

The growth projections for surrounding counties, as provided by the Department of Finance (DOF), are generally lower than that of Placer County with the exception of Sutter and Yuba counties, which are slightly higher. **Table 5-1** below provides growth projections for the surrounding counties of Nevada, Yuba, Sutter, Sacramento, and El Dorado through 2030.

TABLE 5-1
CURRENT AND PROJECTED POPULATION –
PLACER AND SURROUNDING COUNTIES

County	2000 Population	Pro	jected Populat	Percentage Average Annual Growth Rate	
County	2000 F Opulation	2010	2020	2030	(2000–2030)
Placer	252,223	347,543	428,535	512,509	3.4
El Dorado	158,621	189,308	221,140	247,570	1.9
Nevada	92,532	102,649	114,451	123,940	1.1
Sacramento	1,233,575	1,451,866	1,622,306	1,803,872	1.5
Sutter	79,632	102,326	141,159	182,401	4.3
Yuba	60,598	80,411	109,216	137,322	4.2

Source: DOF, 2007b

Table 5-2 compares the population estimates for the period 1990 through 2009 for Placer County, its incorporated cities and town, and the State of California. According to DOF (2009) population estimates, the county had a population of 339,577 in 2009, a nearly 2 percent increase from the previous year.

TABLE 5-2
POPULATION ESTIMATES 1990 THROUGH 2008 – PLACER COUNTY, INCORPORATED CITIES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

	Рори	ılation	Percentage	Population	Percentage	Percentage Average
Municipality	1990	2000	Change (1990–2000)	2009	Change (2000–2009)	Annual Growth Rate (1990–2009)
Placer County	172,796	248,399	+43.8	339,577	+36.7	+5.1
City of Auburn	10,653	12,462	+17.0	13,432	+7.8	+1.4
City of Colfax	1,306	1,520	+16.4	1,878	+23.6	+2.3
City of Lincoln	7,248	11,205	+54.6	40,060	+257.5	+23.8
Town of Loomis	5,705	6,260	+9.7	6,677	+6.7	+0.9
City of Rocklin	18,806	36,330	+99.6	54,754	+50.7	+10.1
City of Roseville	44,685	79,921	+78.9	112,343	+40.6	+8.0
California	29,558,000	33,873,086	+14.6	38,049,462	+12.3	+1.6

Source: DOF, 2007a; DOF, 2009

According to the population estimates shown in **Table 5-2**, the county has experienced an average annual growth rate of about 5.1 percent between 1990 and 2009. This growth has occurred at a relatively steady pace and at a higher rate than the state as a whole.

5.1.2 Housing

Housing Trends

Population projections are converted to numbers of households by using an average household size for each year. The average household size in the county is low compared to the state average (2.564 persons for the county, compared to 2.923 persons for the state) and has been falling slightly over the past decade (see **Table 5-3**).

TABLE 5-3
HOUSEHOLD SIZE (PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD) 2000–2008 – PLACER COUNTY,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Average
Placer County (including cities)	2.629	2.631	2.614	2.587	2.561	2.543	2.520	2.514	2.513	2.524	2.564
California	2.873	2.898	2.919	2.933	2.942	2.940	2.931	2.930	2.938	2.940	2.923

Source: DOF, 2009

The county was estimated to contain about 149,265 housing units in 2009, about 78 percent of which were detached single-family units (see **Table 5-4**). Attached single-family units represent only 3.2 percent of the housing stock, while multi-family units represent about 15.5 percent and mobile homes represent about 3.2 percent of the housing stock.

TABLE 5-4
HOUSING UNITS BY TYPE – PLACER COUNTY

	2000			Paraontago					
Housing Unit Type	Units	Percentage of Total*	Units	Percentage of Total*	Percentage Change				
Single-Family	Single-Family								
Detached	81,465	75.9	116,629	78.1	+43.2				
Attached	4,136	3.9	4,781	3.2	+15.6				
Total Single-Family	85,601	79.8	121,410	81.3	+41.8				
Multi-Family									
2–4 Units	5,675	5.3	6,369	4.3	+12.2				
5+ Units	11,357	10.6	16,743	11.2	+47.4				
Total Multi-Family	17,032	15.9	23,112	15.5	+35.7				
Mobile Homes	4,669	4.3	4,743	3.2	+1.6				
Total Units	107,302	100	149,265	100	+39.1				

Source: DOF, 2009

5.1.3 Employment

Employment Trends

Employment by Industry

In 2010, the county had a total of 137,300 employed individuals, an increase of 12,400 since 2005. This represents an approximately 10 percent increase for the period or an average annual growth rate of about 2 percent (EDD, 2011a). County employment by industry is summarized in **Table 5-5** below.

TABLE 5-5
INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT STATUS IN PLACER COUNTY

Industry	Employment 2005	Employment 2010	Percentage Change	Employment Distribution (2010)
Total Wage and Salary	137,300	124,900	-9.0%	100.0%
Natural Resources and Mining	100	100	0%	0.1%
Farm	600	300	-50.0%	0.2%
Construction	16,800	8,400	-50.0%	6.7%
Manufacturing	9,200	6,700	-27.2%	5.4%
Trade, Transportation and Utilities	26,400	25,700	-2.7%	20.6%
Information	2,700	2,400	-11.1%	1.9%
Financial Activities	11,100	9,700	-12.6%	7.8%
Professional and Business Services	14,600	12,800	-12.3%	10.3%

Industry	Employment 2005	Employment 2010	Percentage Change	Employment Distribution (2010)
Educational and Health Services	13,600	17,900	-31.6%	14.3%
Leisure and Hospitality	18,100	17,900	-1.1%	14.3%
Other Services	4,200	4,600	-9.5%	3.7%
Government	20,000	18,400	-8.0%	14.7%

Source: EDD, 2011a

Unemployment

Placer County's 2000 unemployment rate was estimated to be about 2.6 percent (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). The recent economic climate has resulted in a significant increase in the unemployment rate within the county as well as throughout the state and country. As of June 2011, the county's unemployment rate was estimated at 11.4 percent (EDD, 2011b).

Major Employers

The economy of Placer County is largely within the service, retail trade, and manufacturing industries. The top ten employers in Placer County are shown in **Table 5-6**. The majority of these employers are located in the City of Roseville with the exception of Placer County, which has its main administrative buildings located in the Auburn area.

TABLE 5-6
MAJOR EMPLOYERS WITHIN PLACER COUNTY

Company	Number of Employees
Hewlett-Packard	3,800
Placer County	3,092
Sutter Health	2,605
Kaiser Permanente	2,418
PRIDE Industries, Inc.	1,429
Union Pacific Railroad Co., Inc.	1,324
City of Roseville	1,243
Raley's, Inc.	1,195
Roseville Joint Union High School District	1,018
Dry Creek Joint Elementary School District	992
	19,116

Source: City of Rocklin, 2009

Household Income

In 2009, Placer County had a per capita personal income (PCPI) of \$45,614. This PCPI ranked 14th in the state and was 108 percent of the state average, \$42,395, and 115 percent of the national average, \$39,635. The County's 2009 PCPI reflected a decrease of 4.3 percent from 2008. In 1999, the PCPI of Placer County was \$36,102 and ranked 6th in the state. The 1999 to 2009 average annual growth rate of PCPI was 2.4 percent. Comparatively, the average annual growth rate for the state was 3.3 percent and for the nation was 3.4 percent (BEA, 2011).

Commuting Patterns

In 2000, the mean travel time to work of employed Placer County residents was 27 minutes, with about 94 percent of residents working outside the home and 6 percent working within the home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

5.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

5.2.1 Federal

Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970

The Uniform Act, passed by Congress in 1970, is a federal law that establishes minimum standards for federally funded programs and projects that require the acquisition of real property (real estate) or displace persons from their homes, businesses, or farms. The Uniform Act's protections and assistance apply to the acquisition, rehabilitation, or demolition of real property for federally funded projects. The act is implemented by government-wide regulations set forth in 49 CFR Part 24.

Title 24 - Housing and Urban Development Part 42

Displacement, Relocation Assistance, and Real Property Acquisition for HUD and HUD-Assisted Programs

Section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development (HCD) Act provides minimum requirements for federally funded programs or projects when units that are part of a community's low-income housing supply are demolished or converted to a use other than lower moderate-income dwellings.

Section 104(d) requirements include:

- Replacement, on a one-for-one basis, of all occupied and vacant occupiable low- or moderate-income dwelling units that are demolished or converted to a use other than low- or moderate-income housing in connection with an activity assisted under the HCD act; and
- Provision of certain relocation assistance to any lower-income person displaced as a direct result of the following activities in connection with federal assistance:
 - Demolition of any dwelling unit, or
 - Conversion of a low- or moderate-income dwelling unit to a use other than a low- or moderate-income residence.

Section 104(d) requirements are triggered by the use of HOME, CDBG, Section 108 Loan Guarantee, or UDAG funding in a project involving the demolition or conversion of low- or moderate-income housing.

5.2.2 State

California Relocation Statute – Government Code Section 7260

The California Relocation Statute is a California law that establishes minimum standards for state-funded programs and projects that require the acquisition of real property (real estate) or displace persons from their homes, businesses, or farms. The statute's protections and assistance apply to the acquisition, rehabilitation, or demolition of real property for state-funded projects. The statute is intended for the benefit of displaced persons, to ensure that such persons receive fair and equitable treatment and do not suffer disproportionate injuries as the result of programs designed for the benefit of the public as a whole. Title 25, Division 1, Chapter 6 of the California Code of Regulations provides the regulatory guidelines to enforce the statute.

Title 25 Division 1 Chapter 6 Subchapter 1 – Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition

This section of Title 25 provides guidelines to assist public entities in the development of regulations and procedures implementing Government Code Section 7260. The guidelines are designed to carry out the following policies of Section 7260:

- 1) To ensure that uniform, fair, and equitable treatment is afforded persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms as a result of the actions of a public entity in order that such persons shall not suffer disproportionate injury as a result of action taken for the benefit of the public as a whole; and
- 2) In the acquisition of real property by a public entity, to ensure consistent and fair treatment for owners of real property to be acquired, to encourage and expedite acquisition by agreement with owners of such property in order to avoid litigation and relieve congestion in courts, and to promote confidence in public land acquisition.

Proposition 46

In November 2002, the "Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2002" was passed by the voters of California. Prop. 46 created a trust fund to provide shelters for battered women, clean and safe housing for low-income senior citizens, emergency shelters for homeless families with children, housing with social services for homeless and mentally ill persons, repairs/accessibility improvements to apartments for families and handicapped citizens, veteran homeownership assistance, and security improvements/repairs to existing emergency shelters. Funded by a bond issue of \$2.1 billion, Prop. 46 makes cities and counties eligible to receive specified funds and subjects expenditures to independent audit. Prop. 46 also appropriates money from the state general fund to repay bonds.

State Housing Policies

State law requires each local government in California to adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of their city or county. The housing element is one of the seven mandated elements of the general plan. State law requires local government plans to

address the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community through their housing elements. The purpose of the housing element is to identify the community's housing needs, to state the community's goals and objectives with regard to housing production, rehabilitation, and conservation to meet those needs, and to define the policies and programs that the community will implement to achieve the stated goals and objectives. The Placer County Housing Element provides goals, polices, and implementation programs for the planning and development of housing throughout unincorporated Placer County. The Housing Element Background Report identifies the nature and extent of the county's housing needs in the unincorporated areas of the county, which in turn provides the basis for the County's response to those needs in the Housing Element Policy Document. In addition to identifying housing needs, the Background Report also presents information on the setting in which the needs occur, which provides a better understanding of the community and facilitates planning for housing.

State law sets out a process for determining each local jurisdiction's fair share of regional housing needs, called the Regional Housing Needs Determination. As a first step in the process, the California Department of Housing and Community Development assigns each regional council of governments a needed number of new housing units for that region, including affordable housing.

5.2.3 Local

Placer County General Plan

The Housing Element of the Placer County General Plan provides goals, objectives, and policies regarding economics and housing in the county. General Plan housing policies applicable to the proposed Project are summarized in **Table 5-7**. While this DEIR analyzes the Project's consistency with the Placer County General Plan pursuant to CEQA Section 15125(d), the Placer County Board of Supervisors will ultimately make the determination of the Project's consistency with the General Plan. Environmental impacts associated with any inconsistency with General Plan policies are addressed under the impact discussions of this EIR.

TABLE 5-7
GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS – POPULATION AND HOUSING

General Plan Policies	Consistency Determination	Analysis
Policy 1.N.10: The County shall support the development of primary wage earner job opportunities in the South Placer area to provide residents an alternative to commuting to Sacramento.	Consistent	The proposed Project would create and/or relocate up to 97 jobs into the South Placer area.

Granite Bay Community Plan

The Granite Bay Community Plan (GBCP) contains no population, housing, or employment policies that pertain to the proposed Project.

5.3 IMPACTS

5.3.1 Significance Criteria

The population and housing impact analysis provided below is based on the application of the following State CEQA Guidelines Appendix G thresholds of significance, as specifically defined for the proposed Project. A project is considered to have a significant impact if it would:

- 1) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- 2) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- 3) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

5.3.2 Methodology

PMC staff conducted research on demographic and housing conditions, utilizing existing documents and other information sources. Information was obtained from governmental agencies through their websites. Among these agencies were the U.S. Bureau of the Census and the California Department of Finance. The Placer County Housing Element and the Granite Bay Community Plan were additional sources of information on housing and economic conditions as well as on housing policy.

5.3.3 Project-Level Impacts and Mitigation Measures

IMPACT 5.1: Displace Substantial Numbers of Existing Housing or People

The proposed Project site is currently undeveloped and does not contain any residential uses. Therefore, the proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people and would not require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, **no impact** associated with housing or population displacement would occur and no mitigation is required.

IMPACT 5.2: Induce Population Growth

The proposed Project consists of the construction and operation of a house of worship facility. No residential uses would be constructed as a part of the Project; therefore, no direct population growth would occur. The facility is estimated to employ approximately 97 workers at full buildout (Phases I and II) and is not considered to be a significant new employment center. Given the large labor force within the county and the high unemployment rate (11.4 percent as of June 2011) (EDD, 2011), it is anticipated that these positions would likely be filled by workers in the area. Should new workers move into the area to work at the proposed Project, the county's housing stock would be sufficient to accommodate this shift. Furthermore, development of the site would not remove any barriers to development of the surrounding area or result in the construction of new roadways or infrastructure that could indirectly result in additional development or associated population growth. Therefore, the proposed Project would not be expected to result in any significant population growth, either directly or indirectly, and this impact is considered **less than significant**. No further mitigation is required.