

#### INTRODUCTION

This chapter of the EIR describes the existing population, employment, and housing levels in both Placer County and the Sacramento metropolitan region. The purpose of this chapter is to identify, estimate, and evaluate population, employment, and housing changes that would be caused by development of the proposed project that have the potential to cause physical environmental effects. Any physical environmental effects associated with the increase in population are discussed in the technical sections contained in Chapter 6.

The increased population and changes to demographics resulting from new development do not necessarily cause direct adverse physical environmental effects; however, indirect physical environmental effects such as population-driven traffic or air quality impacts could occur. These indirect physical environmental effects are analyzed in the relevant technical sections of this EIR.

No comments were received in response to the NOP relating to population, employment, or housing issues.

Sources used in the preparation of this section include:<sup>1</sup>

- Placer County General Plan (1994)
- Placer County General Plan Housing Element (2003)
- U.S. Census (2000)
- Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)
- California Employment Development Department (EDD)
- California Department of Finance (DOF)
- Placer County Planning Department (market-based population, employment, and housing projections)

The information contained in this chapter is used as a basis for analysis of project and cumulative impacts in the technical sections of this EIR. However, changes in population and employment, in and of themselves, are generally characterized as social and economic effects, not physical effects on the environment. CEQA provides that economic or social effects are not considered significant effects on the environment unless the social and/or economic effects are connected to physical environmental effects. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant (CEQA Guidelines Section15382). The direction for treatment of economic and social effects is stated in Section 15131(a) of the CEQA Guidelines:

\_

As shown above, this chapter contains information from a variety of sources. Inclusion of any particular data is not intended to imply that any one source is right or wrong; the intent is to inform the reader of the growth trends in the region. Each of these sources uses different modeling and different assumptions to project growth, resulting in different results. While there are differences in the numbers, however, the growth trend demonstrated by each of these sources is consistent.

Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on physical changes.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

# **Population**

## **Regional Population**

Placer, El Dorado, Sacramento, and Yolo counties comprise the Sacramento-Yolo Combined Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA). One of the most rapidly growing CMSAs in the State, the population in the Sacramento-Yolo CMSA grew 18 percent in 10 years, from approximately 1.5 million in 1990 to approximately 1.8 million in 2000.<sup>2</sup> Current trends in population growth are expected to continue, with the Sacramento-Yolo CMSA population reaching 2,456,959 by 2020.<sup>3</sup>

#### Placer County Population

According to the U.S. Census, Placer County's population was 172,796 in 1990 and 248,399 in 2000. Placer County is one of the fastest growing counties in California with respect to the rate of growth. DOF estimates Placer County's January 1, 2004 population at 296,579 and January 1, 2005 population at 305,675. This represents a three (3) percent annual increase over 2004-2005. With a projected population of 349,113 by 2010, 456,040 by 2020, 544,690 by 2030, and 603,637 by 2040, DOF projects this cycle of rapid growth to continue. SACOG's Placer County population projections include a 2010 population of 330,381 and a 2020 population of 390,240. DOF's population projections would therefore be greater than those forecasted by SACOG. SACOG's population projections for the unincorporated area of Placer County show an increase of approximately 38,000 between 2010 and 2020. There are no specific population projections from DOF or SACOG for the western Placer County region.

The Placer County Planning Department prepared a set of market-based population projections for Placer County and the West Placer Study Area through 2050 (Table 5-1). Total County population estimates for 2005 are based on a projection from a 2002 base year and are lower than estimated by DOF for January 2005. The countywide population projections show 334,100 by 2010, 404,500 by 2020, 474,900 by 2030, 545,300 by 2040, and 616,000 by 2050. Overall, the County projections are greater than SACOG's, but less than those forecasted by DOF.

\_

Gaela Mitchell, Data Request Specialist, SACOG, source data ref: Population Estimates Program, Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau, personal communication, January 10, 2006.

Gaela Mitchell, Data Request Specialist, SACOG, source data ref: Population Estimates Program, Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau, personal communication, January 10, 2006.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Census, American FactFinder, <a href="http://www.factfinder.census.gov">http://www.factfinder.census.gov</a>> (February 13, 2006).

<sup>5</sup> California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, <a href="http://www.dof.ca.gov">http://www.dof.ca.gov</a> (February 13, 2006).

<sup>6</sup> California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, <a href="http://www.dof.ca.gov">http://www.dof.ca.gov</a> (February 13, 2006).

<sup>7</sup> Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Projection Data, 12-16-04 < http://www.sacog.org> (February 14, 2006).

<sup>8</sup> Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Projection Data, 12-16-04 < http://www.sacog.org> (February 14, 2006).

**TABLE 5-1** 

#### **POPULATION PROJECTIONS 2005-2050**

|  | 2005    | 2010    | 2015    | 2020    | 2025    | 2030    | 2035    | 2040    | 2045    | 2050    | NET CHANGE<br>2005-2050 |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------------|
| Placer County  |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |                         |
| Total Population   | 299,000 | 334,100 | 369,300 | 404,500 | 439,700 | 474,900 | 510,100 | 545,300 | 580,500 | 616,000 | 317,000                 |
| Household Population   | 295,600 | 330,400 | 365,200 | 400,000 | 434,800 | 469,600 | 504,400 | 539,200 | 574,000 | 609,000 | 313,400                 |
| Group Quarters Population                                    | 3,400   | 3,700   | 4,100   | 4,500   | 4,900   | 5,300   | 5,700   | 6,100   | 6,500   | 7,000   | 3,600                   |
| West Placer Study Area Total Household Population by Subarea |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |                         |
| West Placer Planning Areas*                                  | 4,300   | 5,600   | 10,500  | 16,800  | 24,200  | 33,200  | 44,000  | 57,200  | 71,300  | 85,900  | 81,600                  |
| Other Unincorporated Areas                                   | 65,000  | 70,900  | 77,200  | 83,100  | 89,100  | 94,500  | 99,300  | 104,100 | 108,900 | 113,800 | 48,800                  |
| Lincoln Planning Area  | 27,200  | 33,700  | 41,900  | 51,500  | 61,500  | 72,200  | 82,700  | 92,600  | 103,900 | 115,000 | 87,800                  |
| Other Cities**   | 170,200 | 189,000 | 202,500 | 213,700 | 223,700 | 232,100 | 239,900 | 246,000 | 250,100 | 254,300 | 84,100                  |
| Total Household Population                                   | 266,700 | 299,200 | 332,100 | 365,100 | 398,500 | 432,000 | 465,900 | 499,900 | 534,200 | 569,000 | 302,300                 |
| Group Quarters Population                                    | 3,000   | 3,400   | 3,700   | 4,200   | 4,500   | 4,900   | 5,200   | 5,700   | 6,100   | 6,500   | 3,500                   |
| Total Population   | 269,700 | 302,600 | 335,800 | 369,300 | 403,000 | 436,900 | 471,100 | 505,600 | 540,300 | 575,500 | 305,800                 |

#### Notes:

Group quarters population is projected to remain a constant share of total population over time; therefore group quarters population increases proportional to the overall increase in population.

The estimates for unincorporated areas have been adjusted so that there is no change in the total population for the West Placer Study Area or the County overall.

Household population growth is based on the following assumptions:

- ▶ About two-thirds of the residential development potential in the West Placer Planning Areas would be built and occupied by 2050.
- ▶ Development in the rest of unincorporated West Placer County continues at a pace similar to past trends; this area would have the most development capacity remaining in 2050.
- ▶ About 85 percent of the residential development potential in the Lincoln Planning Area would be built and occupied by 2050.
- ▶ About 95 percent of the residential development potential in the Other Cities would be built and occupied by 2050.

Source: Placer County Planning Department, Draft Best Case Population Projections, 10/06/05.

<sup>\*</sup> Includes the Regional University & Community, Curry Creek, Placer Ranch, and Placer Vineyards planning areas.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Auburn, Loomis, Rocklin, and Roseville.

Total population includes group quarters and household population.

The West Placer Study Area includes the West Placer Planning Area, other incorporated areas, the Lincoln Planning Area, and other cities (Auburn, Loomis, Rocklin, and Roseville). The West Placer Planning Area includes the Regional University and Community, Curry Creek, Placer Ranch, and Placer Vineyards planning areas. Population projections for the West Placer Planning Area show 5,600 by 2010, 16,800 by 2020, 33,200 by 2030, 57,200 by 2040, and 85,900 by 2050. Over the next 40 years, Placer County's projections for the West Placer Planning Area represent roughly between 2 and 14 percent of the countywide total population projections.

#### **Employment**

# **Regional Employment**

The economy in the greater Sacramento region experienced significant expansion during the 1990s, as non-agricultural employment throughout the region continued to grow, including educational, health and social services, retail trade, professional, scientific, management and administrative, and manufacturing. The region's manufacturing sector has steadily grown with expansion of high-technology industries. Services, retail trade, and government employment sectors increased to meet the needs of the region's expanding population base. Placer County shared in the region's economic expansion with its own rapid growth.

# Placer County Employment

Placer County's economy is evolving from its traditional dependence on the railroad industry, lumber and wood products industry, and agriculture to more of a focus on construction, trade, transportation and utilities, and education and health services. These industries lead job growth, contributing 13,800 additional jobs during 2000-2004. EDD reports Placer County's industries have added a total of 22,500 new jobs since 2000, accounting for cumulative growth of more than 20 percent, pushing the County's total to approximately 134,000 jobs in 2004. In 2005, Placer County's total labor force was 160,800, of which 5,700, or 3.6 percent, were unemployed. Employment levels in Placer County are estimated to reach 214,411 by 2020.

The Placer County Planning Department prepared a set of market-based employment projections for Placer County and the West Placer Study Area through 2050, which includes campus employment at Regional University (Table 5-2). Employment projections for Placer County show 197,000 jobs by 2010 and 253,000 jobs by 2020. The West Placer Study Area employment projections show 188,000 jobs by 2010 and 242,000 jobs by 2020. Employment projections for the Unincorporated Areas (including Regional University, Curry Creek, Placer Ranch, and Placer Vineyards planning areas, as well as the rest of the Sunset Industrial area and all other unincorporated area in West Placer County) of the West Placer Study Area show 37,570 jobs by 2010 and 48,505 jobs by 2020. SACOG projects employment levels in unincorporated Placer County estimated to reach 55,757 by 2020. Ultimate 2050 employment projections for Placer County, West Placer Study Area, and Unincorporated Areas are 421,000, 408,000, and 112,435, respectively.

-

<sup>9</sup> California Employment Development Department, <a href="http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov">http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov</a> (February 14, 2006).

<sup>10</sup> California Employment Development Department, <a href="http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov">http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov</a> (February 14, 2006).

Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Projection Data, 12-16-04 <a href="http://www.sacog.org">http://www.sacog.org</a> (February 14, 2006).

<sup>12</sup> Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Projection Data, 12-16-04 < http://www.sacog.org> (February 14, 2006).

| TABLE 5-2                                  |  |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |                                |
|--|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------------------------------|
| EMPLOYMENT-JOBS BY PLACE OF WORK 2005-2050 |  |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |                                |
|  | 2005   | 2010    | 2015    | 2020    | 2025    | 2030    | 2035    | 2040    | 2045    | 2050    | Net<br>Change<br>2005-<br>2050 |
| Placer County<br>Total                     |  |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |                                |
| Employment                                 | 169,000  | - ,     | 225,000 | 253,000 |         | 309,000 | 337,000 | 365,000 | 393,000 | 421,000 | 252,000                        |
| West Placer Stud                           | West Placer Study Area Total Employment By Subarea |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |                                |
| Unincorporated<br>Areas*                   | 33,790   | 37,570  | 42,295  | 48,505  | 56,205  | 65,385  | 75,465  | 86,535  | 99,275  | 112,435 | 78,645                         |
| Lincoln<br>Planning Area                   | 7,060  | 11,380  | 17,455  | 24,205  | 31,905  | 40,815  | 50,895  | 59,535  | 68,495  | 77,175  | 70,115                         |
| Other Cities**                             | 120,150  | 139,050 | 155,250 | 169,290 | 181,890 | 190,800 | 198,640 | 205,930 | 212,230 | 218,390 | 98,240                         |
| Total Study<br>Area                        | 161,000  | 188,000 | 215,000 | 242,000 | 270,000 | 297,000 | 325,000 | 352,000 | 380,000 | 408,000 | 247,000                        |

Notes:

## Housing

# **Regional Housing Supply**

The housing supply in the Sacramento region continues to grow. An improving employment outlook across both the State and in the Sacramento region is expected to serve to maintain the pace of home building and sales in the six county SACOG region, including Placer, Sacramento, El Dorado, Yolo, Sutter, and Yuba counties. Housing permit applications provide a good indicator of the future supply. Housing permit activity has accelerated over the past three years, and as a result, increases in housing supply are projected to continue. Although, as the Sacramento region continues to build near record numbers of new homes, there are indications that the region may be close to filling the backlog of housing demand and entering a period of more balanced supply and demand.<sup>13</sup>

#### Placer County Housing Supply

Placer County had a total of 107,302 housing units in 2000, of which 93,382 were occupied units. <sup>14</sup> The total housing units in 2000 represent a 73 percent increase over the 1990 housing supply. Nearly 80 percent of the units built during this time period were single-family residences. <sup>15</sup> In 2000, there were 13,920 vacant housing units in Placer County, representing 13 percent of the total

<sup>\*</sup> Includes the Regional University & Community, Curry Creek, Placer Ranch, and Placer Vineyards planning areas, as well as the rest of the Sunset Industrial area and all other unincorporated areas in West Placer County. Includes campus employment at the Regional University & Community and at Placer Ranch.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Auburn, Loomis, Rocklin, and Roseville.

Source: Placer County Planning Department, Draft Best Case Population Projections, October 10, 2005.

California Institute for County Government, July 2004 Housing Forecast Highlights, <a href="http://www.cicg.org">http://www.cicg.org</a> (February 16, 2005).

<sup>14</sup> U.S. Census, American FactFinder, <a href="http://www.factfinder.census.gov">http://www.factfinder.census.gov</a>> (February 13, 2006).

<sup>15</sup> U.S. Census, American FactFinder, <a href="http://www.factfinder.census.gov">http://www.factfinder.census.gov</a> (February 13, 2006).

housing units countywide. 16 SACOG projects Placer County would reach 153,943 housing units in 2020.1

# **Jobs-Housing Balance**

The concept of jobs/housing balance refers to the relationship of residences to jobs in a given community or area. Assuming a reasonable match between the affordability of housing and the incomes of jobs in the local market, if the number and proximity of residences is proportionate to the number and proximity of jobs, the majority of the employees would have the opportunity to work and reside in the same community. A well-balanced ratio of jobs and housing can contribute to reductions in the number of vehicle trips resulting from commuting due to employment opportunities in closer proximity to residential areas. Such a reduction in vehicle trips would necessarily result in lower levels of air pollutant emissions and less congestion on area roadways and intersections. As noted above, another important consideration in evaluating the jobs/housing balance is whether housing in the community is affordable to local employees. The availability of an adequate housing supply, presenting various price levels including those that are reasonably available to those holding jobs that are offered in the community, provides the potential to reduce the length of commutes between residences and work sites.

Placer County's employment base in 2000 was 123,875 in the labor force, with 107,302 total housing units, and of these units, 93,382 were occupied, resulting in a 13 percent vacancy rate. 18 Assuming a employee per unit ratio of 1.15 countywide, approximately 123,397 workers could be housed within the County. It is important to note that Placer County generally imports employees from surrounding areas such as Auburn, Rocklin, and other portions of incorporated Placer County. The extent to which this occurs depends on a variety of factors related not only to employment and housing in the County, but economic factors affecting the County and region. One of these factors is affordability of housing. People are often willing to commute longer distances from areas where their housing dollar goes further. Therefore, the County also exports a significant number of employees to the Sacramento region's employment centers.

#### REGULATORY SETTING

#### Federal Regulations

There are no specific federal regulations pertaining to population that address environmental impacts associated with the proposed project.

#### **State Regulations**

There are no specific State regulations pertaining to population that address environmental impacts associated with the proposed project.

<sup>16</sup> U.S. Census, American FactFinder, <a href="http://www.factfinder.census.gov">http://www.factfinder.census.gov</a>> (February 13, 2006).

<sup>17</sup> Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Projection Data, 12-16-04 <a href="http://www.sacog.org">http://www.sacog.org</a>

<sup>18</sup> U.S. Census, American FactFinder, <a href="http://www.factfinder.census.gov">http://www.factfinder.census.gov</a>> (February 13, 2006).

# **Local Regulations**

## **Placer County General Plan**

The various goals, policies, and implementation programs of the Placer County General Plan seek to minimize population-related impacts by providing a comprehensive framework for the preparation of individual specific plans that ensure that local and regional concerns are adequately addressed in the planning of major new growth areas and that such areas are planned to avoid adverse economic impacts on existing urban centers. The following are applicable goals and policies relating to employment and housing issues from the adopted Placer County General Plan Housing Element (2003) and Land Use Element (1994).

#### 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.

#### **Policies**

- A.2. The County shall maintain an adequate supply of appropriately zoned land with public services to accommodate projected housing needs.
- A.4. The County shall give highest priority for permit processing to development projects that include a low-income residential component.
- A.5. The County shall encourage "mixed-use" projects where housing is provided in conjunction with compatible non-residential uses.
- 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.
- 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.
- A.11. The County shall require low-income-housing units in density bonus or inclusionary projects to be available concurrently with the market-rate units in the project to avoid delaying the construction of the affordable units to the end of the project.
- A.13. The County shall facilitate expanded housing opportunities that are affordable to the County's workforce.
- A.16. The County will encourage the development of multi-family dwellings in locations where adequate infrastructure and public services are available.
- A.18. For residential projects where 10 percent of the units are affordable to very low-income households, or 20 percent are affordable to low-income households, 50 percent of the development-related fees over which the County has direct control shall be waived. The Board of Supervisors may waive more fees as an additional incentive for affordable housing on a case by-case basis.

#### Goal B To promote quality residential development in the County.

#### **Policy**

B.1. The County encourages residential development of high architectural and physical quality that is compatible with neighboring land uses.

#### Jobs-Housing Balance

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

#### **Policies**

- 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.
- 1.M.2. The County shall encourage large residential projects to be phased or timed to occur simultaneously with development that will provide primary wage-earner jobs.
- 1.M.3. 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 exists.

## **Affordable Housing Requirements**

Placer County has accepted the principles of the SACOG Affordable Housing Compact. The SACOG Compact provides for the following voluntary production standards:

At least 10 percent of all new housing construction should meet an affordability standard. The 10 percent goal would be guided by the following rules:

- At least four percent of all new housing construction will be affordable to very low-income families.
- At least four percent of all new housing construction will be affordable to low-income families.
- Up to two percent of the 10 percent goal could be met by housing affordable to moderateincome families.

In addition, Placer County staff has provided guidance on affordable housing for the proposed Placer Ranch, Placer Vineyards, and Regional University specific plan projects. The County's objective is to achieve consistency among the currently proposed specific plans, recognizing each specific plan will have its own unique challenges when addressing affordable housing. Each specific plan shall provide the following information within the affordable housing discussion:

- 1) Affordable Housing Allocation At least 10% of the units proposed shall be affordable. The distribution shall be 4% very low, 4% low and 2% moderate (as defined by the State of California, Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)). A table with a break down of units should be included. Mixed Use units (CMU or MU) are not required to be included in the affordable house 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 are those set forth by

- HCD. Affordability criteria from HCD generally include: definition of affordable housing cost, eligible households and terms of affordability.
- 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.

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

- Density Bonus A general discussion of anticipated density bonus requests may be provided; however, additional requirements for approval of a density bonus may be described in the project development agreement.
- 2) Implementation Each project is responsible for building the required affordable housing. Options such as land dedication, credits/transfers, and in-lieu fees 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 must be developed concurrent with market rate units or upon established triggers for construction as set forth in the development agreement.

## Changes in Population, Employment and Housing

## **Proposed Project Population**

The Regional University Specific Plan proposes to construct 4,387 residential units (3,232 in the Community portion and 1,155 on the University Campus). Assuming an average household size of 1.8 to 2.5 persons per unit, depending on house type, this would result in a projected population increase of 10,037. Table 5-3 presents the estimated population generated by the proposed project by land use type. As stated above, increases in population are not, in and of themselves, considered physical environmental effects. Potential physical environmental effects resulting from the proposed project's population growth are analyzed in the appropriate technical sections of this EIR.

# **Proposed Project Employment**

The Regional University Specific Plan proposes a University site and a Community site, each with employment-generating uses. It is anticipated that the proposed project would generate 1,264 jobs at buildout. The University includes an estimate of campus employment of 400 faculty and 400 staff (assuming enrollment of 6,000 students), with the remaining 464 jobs generated in the Community portion. Employment growth would likely occur between 2010 and 2020, with approximately half the jobs being generated during the first five years and the other half during the second five years.

# **Proposed Project Housing Supply**

The Regional University Specific Plan proposes to construct 4,387 residential units in the Plan Area (3,232 within the Community and 1,155 within the University). The proposed project includes low-density, medium-density, and high-density residential uses in the Community portion of the project,

| TABLE 5-3   |                                |                   |                     |                         |  |  |  |  |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| PROPOSED PROJECT ESTIMATED POPULATION GENERATION                              |                                |                   |                     |                         |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use  |                                | Dwelling<br>Units | Persons per<br>Unit | Estimated<br>Population |  |  |  |  |
| LDR (3.8 du/ac)   | Low Density Residential        | 718               | 2.5                 | 1,795                   |  |  |  |  |
| MDR (8 du/ac)   | Medium Density Residential     | 1,508             | 2.5                 | 3,770                   |  |  |  |  |
| HDR (15 du/ac)  | High Density Residential       | 931               | 2.0                 | 1,862                   |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal  |                                | 3,157             |                     | 7,427                   |  |  |  |  |
| VILLAGE SERVICE   | E & EMPLOYMENT                 |                   |                     |                         |  |  |  |  |
| CMU   | Commercial Mixed Use           | 75                | 2.0                 | 150                     |  |  |  |  |
| CPD   | Commercial Planned Development |                   |                     |                         |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal  |                                | 75                |                     | 150                     |  |  |  |  |
| Community Subto   | tal                            | 3,232             |                     | 7,577                   |  |  |  |  |
| UNIVERSITY  |                                |                   |                     |                         |  |  |  |  |
| UZ  | University                     | 750               | 2.0                 | 1,500                   |  |  |  |  |
|   | Faculty Housing                | 330               | 2.5                 | 825                     |  |  |  |  |
|   | Retirement Housing             | 75                | 1.8                 | 135                     |  |  |  |  |
| University Subtota  | nl                             | 1,155             |                     | 2,460                   |  |  |  |  |
| <u>-</u>  | Total                          | 4,387             |                     | 10,037                  |  |  |  |  |
| Source: Hausrath Economics Group and Placer County Planning Department, 2006. |                                |                   |                     |                         |  |  |  |  |

as well as high-density units in a mixed-use component of the project. The University includes staff and faculty housing, student housing, and retirement housing. The number of units for each of these categories is shown in Table 5-3.

# **Proposed Project Affordable Housing Component**

The proposed project would provide for 10 percent of the total dwelling units in the Community portion of the Plan Area (excluding the faculty/staff housing, student housing, retirement housing, and CMU units) for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households. This equates to roughly 316 affordable units (126 units affordable to very low-income, 127 affordable to low-income, and 63 affordable to moderate-income).

# **Proposed Project Jobs/Housing**

The jobs/housing balance in the RUSP area is unique due to the two distinct sites: the University Campus and the Community. The jobs/housing balance within the University Campus area is difficult to quantify due to the potential high number of students that would choose to be full-time students, without being employed. The Community site has approximately 22 acres of Village and Service Employment use, while the University campus would generate faculty and staff employment. The first housing units could be constructed by 2010, with the first employment-generating uses in 2012. This assumes housing units would be constructed two years prior to the construction of employment-generating uses. At buildout, the proposed project would result in production of 4,387 dwelling units, with approximately 1,264 jobs created. The ratio of jobs to housing would therefore be approximately 0.3 jobs per dwelling unit. This would indicate that the number of jobs generated within the Plan Area would be insufficient to maintain an internal jobs/housing balance. However, individual projects, particularly suburban projects, would not be expected to provide an internal balance, but would rely upon other employment areas in the County, such as the Sunset Industrial

Area. In fact, using SACOG projections for employment and housing units for 2020 (214,411 and 153,943, respectively) the countywide jobs/housing balance would be 1.39.

In the case of a community supporting a university campus, a simple calculation of the ratio of jobs to housing units does not accurately depict the relationship between the place of residence and the place of business or activity in the community. This is because there would be a large percentage of housing units that would be occupied by students, many of whom do not work or work only part time; using a strict jobs-housing ratio would give the appearance of a shortage of jobs in the area. To more accurately depict the jobs/housing relationship of the community and campus, one must consider student enrollment as an occupation or "job." In doing so, the jobs-housing ratio would also be reflective of the travel patterns of the students whose time is occupied at the campus. Assuming the student enrollment as the equivalent of employment, the jobs-housing ratio of the campus and Community would be 1.66 ([1,264 jobs + 6,000 student enrollment]/4,387 housing units). The resulting jobs-housing ratio for the entire County with student enrollment would be 1.43 ([214,411 jobs + 6,000 students] / 153,943 housing units). Given the size of the proposed project relative to the existing and projected growth in the County and, the proposed project would not negatively affect the jobs/housing ratio.