

## **5.0 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT**

5.0 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

This section analyzes the potential impacts of the proposed Northstar Mountain Master Plan (NMMP) on local population, housing, and employment characteristics. It describes the demographics of the region, reviews applicable General Plan and Martis Valley Community Plan provisions, and estimates anticipated direct and indirect employment growth.

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: Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Roseville, Rocklin, and Loomis. The county’s population on January 1, 2012, was estimated at 355,328, with approximately 31 percent residing in the unincorporated county and the remaining 69 percent residing in the county’s incorporated cities and town (DOF 2012). The county’s 2035 population is projected to be approximately 487,173, with an average projected growth rate of 2.75 percent between 2000 and 2035 (DOF 2011, 2012).

The growth projections for surrounding counties, as provided by the Department of Finance (DOF), are generally lower than for Placer County. **Table 5-1** provides growth projections for the surrounding counties of Nevada, Yuba, Sutter, Sacramento, and El Dorado through 2035.

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

County	2000 Population	Projected Population			Percentage Average Annual Growth Rate (2000–2035)
		2012	2025	2035	
Placer	248,399	355,328	424,134	487,173	2.75
El Dorado	158,288	180,712	218,379	242,330	1.52
Nevada	91,872	97,182	108,863	114,664	0.71
Sacramento	1,230,501	1,435,153	1,643,263	1,821,378	1.37
Sutter	79,202	95,065	119,011	145,637	2.40
Yuba	60,334	72,615	90,103	104,599	2.10

Source: DOF 2011, 2012

**Table 5-2** compares the population estimates for the period 1990 through 2012 for Placer County, its incorporated cities, the Town of Truckee, and California as a whole. According to DOF (2012) population estimates, the county had a population of 355,328 in 2012, a 1.1 percent increase from the previous year.

**TABLE 5-2  
POPULATION ESTIMATES 2000 AND 2012**

Municipality	Population	Population	Percentage Change (2000–2012)
	2000	2012	
Placer County	248,399	355,328	+43.0
City of Auburn	12,462	13,468	+8.1
City of Colfax	1,520	1,977	+30.1
City of Lincoln	11,205	43,572	+288.9
Town of Loomis	6,260	6,500	+3.8
City of Rocklin	36,330	58,295	+60.5
City of Roseville	79,921	122,060	+52.7
Town of Truckee	13,864	15,949	+15.0
California	33,873,086	37,678,563	+11.2

Source: DOF 2007a, 2012

**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 lower than the state average (2.617 persons for the county, compared to 2.916 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) 2000–2012  
PLACER COUNTY, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

	2000	2005	2012
Placer County (including cities)	2.629	2.543	2.617
California	2.873	2.940	2.916

Source: DOF 2009, 2012

The county was estimated to contain approximately 154,525 housing units in 2012, approximately 77.6 percent of which were detached single-family units (see **Table 5-4**). Attached single-family units represent only 2.6 percent of the housing stock, while multi-family units represent approximately 17.0 percent and mobile homes represent approximately 2.8 percent of the housing stock.

**TABLE 5-4  
HOUSING UNITS BY TYPE – PLACER COUNTY**

Housing Unit Type	2000		2012		Percentage Change
	Units	Percentage of Total	Units	Percentage of Total	
Single-Family					
Detached	81,465	75.9	119,885	77.6	+47.2
Attached	4,136	3.9	4,127	2.6	-0.2
Total Single-Family	85,601	79.8	124,012	80.2	+44.9
Multi-Family					
2–4 Units	5,675	5.3	8,376	5.4	+47.6
5+ Units	11,357	10.6	17,880	11.6	+57.4
Total Multi-Family	17,032	15.9	26,256	17.0	+54.2
Mobile Homes	4,669	4.3	4,257	2.8	-8.8
Total Units	107,302	100.0	154,525	100.0	+44.0

Source: DOF 2012

### ***Affordable and Employee Housing Projects***

The Town of Truckee and Placer County take an active role in ensuring the provision of affordable housing in the area.

The Sawmill Heights Apartments provide 96 units of on-site housing (240 beds for employees at Northstar, although employment at Northstar is not a requirement for application). The Sawmill Heights Apartments are managed and owned by a third party. Northstar operates shuttles from the employee housing site, located on Highlands View Road, to the resort.

In Truckee, several additional affordable housing projects provide housing for low- and medium-income families: Henness Flats (92 units), Sierra Village Apartments (57 low-income units), Frishman Hollow (32 units), Truckee Pines Apartments (104 low-income units), Truckee Donner Senior Apartments (59 low-income units), and River View Homes (39 low- and medium-income units).

## **5.1.3 EMPLOYMENT**

### **Employment Trends**

#### ***Employment by Industry and Occupation***

In 2000, Placer County had a total workforce of 159,696 people over the age of 16 (excluding government workers), an increase of 35,727 workers since 1990. This represents a 43.1 percent increase for the period or an average annual growth rate of about 14.3 percent. County employment trends by industry and occupation are summarized in **Tables 5-5** and **5-6**.

**TABLE 5-5  
INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT STATUS IN PLACER COUNTY**

Industry	Employment 2000	Employment 2010	Percentage Average Annual Growth Rate
Total employed over 16 years of age	118,647	156,296	+3.17
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing/Hunting, and Mining	1,120	989	-1.17
Construction	10,860	13,714	+2.62
All Manufacturing	11,789	10,592	-1.02
Wholesale Trade	4,332	4,517	+0.43
Retail Trade	14,440	20,304	+4.06
Transportation, Communications, Information, Warehousing, and Utilities	9,466	7,192	-2.40
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate, and Rental and Leasing	10,180	3,579	-6.48
Professional, Educational, Health, Entertainment, Recreation and Other Services	47,628	15,755	-6.69
Public Administration	8,832	18,864	+11.36

Source: US Census Bureau 2000, 2010

**TABLE 5-6  
LABOR FORCE BY OCCUPATION**

Occupation	Employment 1990	Employment 2010	Percentage Annual Growth Rate
Total employed over 16 years of age	118,647	156,296	+3.17
Management, Professional, and Related Occupations	47,106	63,861	+3.56
Service	15,664	3,148	-8.00
Technical, Sales and Office/Administrative	33,174	44,794	+3.50
Construction, Extraction, Repair and Maintenance, Operators, Laborers, Production, Transportation, Material Moving, Farming, Fishing, and Forestry	22,703	24,493	+0.79

Source: US Census Bureau 1990, 2000

**Unemployment**

Placer County’s 2010 unemployment rate was estimated to be approximately 4.4 percent (US Census Bureau 2010). The recent economic climate has resulted in a significant increase in the unemployment rate in the county as well as throughout the state and country. As of August 2012, the county’s unemployment rate was estimated at 9.3 percent (BLS 2012).

**Major Employers in the Martis Valley Area**

The economy of the Martis Valley area is dependent on the vacation and resort industry, with Martis Valley area employment (Truckee and Placer County) consisting of retail, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food service jobs. Much of the development in the Martis Valley

## 5.0 Population, Housing, and Employment

area is focused on the second home market. Major employers in the Placer County and Town of Truckee portions of the Martis Valley are shown in **Table 5-7**.

**TABLE 5-7  
MAJOR EMPLOYERS WITHIN MARTIS VALLEY**

Company	Approximate Number of Employees in 2009
Sierra Community College District	1,095
Tahoe Forest Hospital District	520
Tahoe Donner Association	160
Town of Truckee	100
Northstar California	1,950 peak season, 240 year-round

Source: Town of Truckee 2011

### Household Income

The county household income is summarized for 1999 and 2012 in **Table 5-8**.

**TABLE 5-8  
HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN PLACER COUNTY**

1999			2012			Percentage Increase
Income Range	Households	Percentage of Households	Income Range	Households	Percentage of Households	
<\$10,000	4,437	4.7	<\$10,000	4,496	3.5	+1.3
\$10,000–14,999	3,793	4.1	\$10,000–14,999	4,486	4.5	+18.3
\$15,000–24,999	8,054	8.6	\$15,000–24,999	9,230	7.1	+14.6
\$25,000–34,999	9,408	10.1	\$25,000–34,999	9,754	7.6	+3.7
\$35,000–49,999	14,132	15.1	\$35,000–49,999	14,810	11.5	+4.8
\$50,000–74,999	20,570	22.0	\$50,000–74,999	22,236	17.2	+8.1
\$75,000–99,999	13,909	14.9	\$75,000–99,999	19,509	15.1	+40.3
\$100,000–149,999	12,063	12.9	\$100,000–149,999	24,756	19.2	+105.2
\$150,000 or more	7,144	7.6	\$150,000–199,999	19,876	15.4	+178.2
	93,510	100		129,153	100	

Source: US Census Bureau 2000, 2012

### Commuting Patterns

In 2012, the mean travel time to work of employed Placer County residents was 27 minutes, with approximately 92.3 percent of residents working outside the home and 7.7 percent working within the home. In the Martis Valley area, commuting includes workers commuting from the Lake Tahoe Basin and nearby communities in the State of Nevada.

## 5.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

### 5.2.1 FEDERAL

No federal regulations apply to this issue.

### 5.2.2 STATE

#### State Housing Policies

State law requires each local government in California to adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of its 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, policies, 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 Allocation. As a first step in the process, the California Department of Housing and Community Development assign each regional council of governments a required number of new housing units for that region, including affordable housing.

### 5.2.3 LOCAL

#### Placer County General Plan, Housing Element

The Placer County General Plan Policy Document was adopted by the Placer County Board of Supervisors in 1994, with the most current Housing Element adopted in 2013. **Table 5-9** lists the General Plan policies that relate to housing and employment and the proposed project and provides an analysis of the project's consistency with these policies. While this Draft EIR analyzes the project's consistency with the Placer County General Plan pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d), the determination of the project's consistency with this General Plan rests with the Placer County Board of Supervisors. Any environmental impacts associated with any inconsistency with General Plan policies are addressed under the impact discussions of this EIR.

**TABLE 5-9  
PLACER COUNTY GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS – POPULATION,  
HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT**

Policies	Consistency Determination	Analysis
<b>Section 1: Land Use</b>		
<p><b>Policy 1.M.3:</b> The County shall encourage the creation of primary wage-earner jobs, or housing which meets projected income levels, in those areas of Placer County where an imbalance between jobs and housing exist.</p>	Consistent	<p>The proposed NMMP is projected to increase employment at the resort by approximately 102 full-time equivalent employees in the winter season, 3 full-time equivalent employees in the summer, and 5 full-time equivalent employees year-round when fully developed (project- and program-level components).</p>
<b>2013 Housing Element</b>		
<p><b>Policy C-2:</b> The County shall require new development in the Sierra Nevada and Lake Tahoe areas to provide for employee housing equal to 50% of the housing demand generated by the project. If the project is an expansion of an existing use, the requirement shall only apply to that portion of the project that is expanded (e.g., physical footprint of the project or an intensification of the use).</p> <p>Employee housing shall be provided for in one of the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of on-site employee housing.</li> <li>• Construction of off-site employee housing.</li> <li>• Dedication of land for needed units; and/or:</li> <li>• Payment of an in-lieu fee.</li> </ul>	Consistent with Mitigation	<p>The proposed NMMP is projected to increase employment at the resort by approximately 102 full-time equivalent employees in the winter season, 3 full-time equivalent employees in the summer, and 5 full-time equivalent employees year-round when fully developed (project- and program-level components). Implementation of mitigation measure 5-3 would ensure that increased employee housing needs are addressed.</p>

**Martis Valley Community Plan**

**Table 5-10** lists the Martis Valley Community Plan policies that relate to housing and employment and the proposed project and provides an analysis of the project’s consistency with these policies. While this Draft EIR analyzes the project’s consistency with the Martis Valley Community Plan pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d), the determination of the project’s consistency with the Community Plan rests with the Placer County Board of Supervisors. Any environmental impacts associated with inconsistency with Community Plan policies are addressed under the impact discussions of this DEIR.

**TABLE 5-10  
MARTIS VALLEY COMMUNITY PLAN CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS – POPULATION,  
HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT**

Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistency Analysis
<b>Section II: Land Use</b>		
<b>Policy 1.A.4:</b> The County shall promote patterns of development that facilitate the efficient and timely provision of urban infrastructure and services.	Consistent	The NMMP project does not propose any new residential or commercial development.
<b>Section II: Population and Housing</b>		
<b>Policy 3.A.4:</b> The County shall require new development in Martis Valley such as Northstar-at-Tahoe, Eaglewood, Siller Ranch, Hopkins Ranch, Martis Ranch, and Waddle Ranch to provide employee housing equal to 50 percent of the housing demand (based on the number of full-time equivalent employees) generated by the project. The housing is intended to serve the needs of the lower or moderate income level employee. Employee housing shall be provided in one of the following ways:  (a) Construction of employee housing onsite; (b) Construction of employee housing offsite; (c) Dedication of land for needed units; (d) Payment of an in-lieu fee.	Consistent with Mitigation	The proposed NMMP is projected to increase employment at the resort by approximately 102 full-time equivalent employees in the winter season, 3 full-time equivalent employees in the summer, and 5 full-time equivalent employees year-round when fully developed (project- and program-level components). Implementation of mitigation measure 5-3 would ensure that increased employee housing needs are addressed.

**5.3 IMPACTS**

**5.3.1 STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The population, housing, and employment impact analysis provided below is based on the application of the following California Environmental Quality Act (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 US Census Bureau and the California Department of Finance. The Placer County Housing Element and the Martis Valley Community

Plan were additional sources of information on housing and economic conditions as well as on housing policy.

The analysis evaluates both project- and program-level components identified in Section 3.0, Project Description.

### 5.3.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### **IMPACT 5.1:** Displace Substantial Numbers of Existing Housing or People

The proposed project does not include any new housing or the removal or improvement of any existing housing. Therefore, the project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people and would not require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There would be **no impact**.

#### **IMPACT 5.2:** Induce Population Growth

The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of various improvements to the Northstar California resort. No residential uses would be constructed as a part of the project. The proposed NMMP is projected to increase employment at the resort by approximately 102 full-time equivalent employees in the winter season, 3 full-time equivalent employees in the summer, and 5 full-time equivalent employees year-round when fully developed (project- and program-level components). Full project buildout is not expected to occur for 20 years. Therefore, the anticipated increases in employment would occur slowly over this period as improvements are completed. For these reasons, the proposed project would not be considered a significant new employment center in the region. Further, given the large labor force within the county and the high unemployment rate, it is anticipated that these positions would likely be filled by existing workers in the area. Development of the project 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 population growth, either directly or indirectly. This impact is considered **less than significant**.

#### **IMPACT 5.3:** Require Additional Employee Housing

As identified in Section 3.0, Project Description, the proposed NMMP improvements are anticipated to generate the following employment at the Northstar resort phased over time, in addition to existing employees:

##### Project-Level Component Employment

- Additional full-time equivalent employees during the winter season: 65
- Additional year-round full-time equivalent employees: 4

##### Program-Level Component Employment

- Additional full-time equivalent employees during the winter season: 37
- Additional year-round full-time equivalent employees: 1

- Additional full-time equivalent employees during the summer season: 3

Additional development planned for the Northstar area, such as the Northstar Village expansion, the Northside, Northstar Highlands, and The Retreat, would generate as many as 1,177 full-time employee equivalent (FTEE) jobs at buildout. Of the 1,177 FTEE jobs generated, 589 employees would be provided with employee housing by the project developers in compliance with Placer County Housing Element Policy C-2. The proposed project would add an additional employee housing demand of 54 FTEEs for a total employee housing demand of 644 FTEEs.

Currently, the Sawmill Heights employee housing project provides accommodations for up to 334 FTEEs, which would not meet the 644 FTEEs demand with the project at buildout of Northstar (Table 5-11).

**TABLE 5-11  
NORTHSTAR EMPLOYMENT GENERATION FOR MAJOR PROJECTS**

Project	Jobs (FTEEs)	Placer County Employee Housing Requirement (FTEEs)
Northstar Village	334	167
Retreat Subdivision	6	3
Northstar Highlands Phase 1	201	101
Northstar Highlands Future Phases	499	250
The Northside	137	69
Proposed NMMP Buildout in Winter	107	54
Total	1,284	644

Source: Placer County 2004

Note: FTEE = full-time employee equivalent

In addition to the Sawmill Heights units, approximately 174 employee-housing units would be available from the future employee housing sites (based on land use designations) located adjacent to the Sawmill Heights site that were programmatically approved as part of the Northstar Highlands project. The development of this additional employee housing (could accommodate up to 605 FTEEs in addition to 335 FTEEs accommodated by Sawmill Heights) would meet County employee housing requirements for the proposed NMMP as well as approved development in Northstar. However, because no timing has been specified for the development of the future employee housing sites, there could be a shortfall of employee housing if future phases are developed in advance of the future employee housing sites or without an employee housing component, resulting in a **potentially significant** impact.

The indirect effects of employees traveling to their job site include traffic impacts and air quality and noise impacts related to traffic. Trips generated by employees of the proposed project are included in the overall trip generation for the project and are discussed in Section 9, Traffic and Circulation. Noise and air quality impacts resulting from these trips are included in the discussions of air quality and noise impacts resulting from trips generated by the project and are discussed in the relevant sections of this DEIR.

### **MITIGATION MEASURE 5-3**      Provision of Employee Housing

The project applicant shall mitigate potential impacts to employee housing through compliance with the Placer County General Plan Housing Element policy (C-2) requiring new Sierra Nevada and Lake Tahoe projects to house 50 percent of the employee housing demand (e.g., FTEE employees) generated by the project. Compliance shall be demonstrated prior to approval of improvement plans for each project component. The project applicant shall submit to Placer County an Employee Housing Mitigation Plan detailing the method of providing the required employee housing units, proposed occupancy (rental or for sale), number of employees served by the employee housing units or, in the case of in-lieu fee payment, number of employees credited, transportation to and from the project, timing of the development of employee housing units, and any incentives requested.

### **SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION**

Implementation of the mitigation measure described above would reduce the affordable housing and employee-housing imbalance impacts of the proposed project to **less than significant**. The above mitigation measure would bring the proposed project into compliance with policies pertaining to housing in the Martis Valley Community Plan and the Placer County Housing Element. Since the specific method of providing employee housing has yet to be determined, it is not possible to determine, through a site-specific analysis, the exact extent of the environmental effects of the provision of the employee housing. However, the following discussion describes the general environmental impacts, to the extent possible, for each of the methods of satisfying the employee housing requirement.

The implementation of mitigation measure 5-3 would have four potential outcomes:

- Development of employee housing on the project site;
- Development of employee housing off-site in the Martis Valley/North Lake Tahoe region;
- Dedication of land to Placer County for development of employee housing; or
- Payment of an in-lieu fee to fund employee housing development.

Each of these options would result in development of employee housing and the environmental effect of fulfilling mitigation measure 5-3. Each option is discussed below.

#### Provision of On-Site Employee Housing

The project does not propose on-site employee housing. However, the proposed project could participate in the development of additional employee housing at the Sawmill Heights site that was programmatically approved as part of the Northstar Highlands project. The environmental effects of the development of this site were disclosed in the Northstar Highlands EIR (State Clearinghouse Number 2003012086) certified by Placer County in February 2004.

#### Provision of Off-Site Employee Housing

Several options exist for providing off-site employee housing. Currently, there are two multifamily housing proposals in the project vicinity that the project applicant could assist with

funding or partner with in the development in order to provide employee housing suitable to meet the needs of the project: proposed Coldstream Specific Plan and proposed Canyon Springs Subdivision in the Town of Truckee (both projects include affordable housing). The project applicant is not precluded from developing employee housing units off-site through any of these methods or from developing an employee housing project not currently proposed (e.g., land area planned for high-density residential development under the Martis Valley Community Plan update) that could meet the project's employee housing need. Potential environmental impacts associated with development of off-site employee housing are summarized below based on review of the Coldstream Specific Plan Draft EIR and the Canyon Springs Draft EIR.

- Loss of habitat for common and special-status species
- Loss of cultural resources
- Water quality effects related to the development of impervious and other urban surfaces, soil erosion, and changes to surface water patterns, drainage, and runoff
- Increased trip generation, resulting in increased use of existing roads and intersections
- Incremental increase in need for public services and utilities
- Changes to public and private views of the project site
- Temporary water quality, noise, air quality, and traffic impacts from project construction

Provision of off-site employee housing could also take the form of substantial rehabilitation of existing housing units. This would likely result in reduced environmental impacts as the site would already be disturbed, reducing the likelihood of impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, visual resources, and surface waters. However, this method of providing employee housing could result in increased trip generation and resultant noise impacts and air emissions as well as increased need for services and utilities, particularly if the rehabilitated units allowed an increase in density over the existing use. This method would also result in temporary water quality, noise, air quality, and traffic impacts from project construction.

### Dedication of Land for Employee Housing

The project applicant could provide land to the County in order to meet the requirements of mitigation measure 5-3. A variety of sites in the area are appropriate for multi-family housing development that could meet the needs of the proposed project. These sites are located in Truckee and in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

While the act of dedicating land to the County would not result in an environmental impact, the future development of employee housing on the site would result in potential environmental impacts, including temporary surface water quality, air quality, and noise impacts associated with construction; operational noise and air quality impacts; increased vehicle trips and congestion on area roadways; biological resource impacts associated with construction and operation; and cultural resource and aesthetic impacts associated with construction. Additionally, an employee housing project would generate increased need for services, including water, wastewater, fire, law enforcement, schools, and recreation facilities.

### Payment of an In-Lieu Fee

The final option associated with mitigation measure 5-3 is payment of an in-lieu fee. While the payment of the fee to the County would not result in an environmental impact, the future development of employee housing utilizing the fee would result in potential environmental impacts, including temporary surface water quality, air quality, and noise impacts associated with construction; operational noise and air quality impacts; increased vehicle trips and congestion on area roadways; biological resource impacts associated with construction and operation; and cultural resource and aesthetic impacts associated with construction. Additionally, an employee housing project would generate increased need for services, including water, wastewater, fire, law enforcement, school, and recreation facilities.