

5 POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

This chapter describes the existing population, employment, and housing conditions in Placer County and Olympic Valley and estimates the changes to those conditions that could be created with implementation of the proposed project. This chapter also characterizes the population, employment, and housing changes that could trigger adverse physical effects in Placer County and Olympic Valley.

5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

5.1.1 Population

PLACER COUNTY

The project site is located in Squaw Valley (also known as Olympic Valley) on the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range, in northeastern Placer County. The county encompasses six incorporated communities: the cities of Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Roseville, and Rocklin, and the Town of Loomis, all located to the west of the project site on the western slopes of the Sierra Nevada foothills and eastern edge of the Sacramento Valley. The county’s population was estimated to be 357,463 people in 2014. Approximately 31 percent of the county’s population resides in the unincorporated county and the remaining 69 percent resides in the county’s incorporated cities and towns (Placer County 2014). The county’s 2030 population is projected to be 442,505 (California Department of Finance 2013a), a growth of nearly 25 percent from 2013.

The project site is located approximately 18 miles west of the border between California and the state of Nevada. Nevada County is located north of Placer County; its largest metropolitan area, the City of Truckee, is located approximately 11 miles north of the project site. The general project region is sparsely populated and the largest metropolitan areas consist of Reno and Sparks, located approximately 40 miles northeast of the project site in Washoe County, Nevada. Table 5-1 provides growth projections for Placer County and the surrounding counties of Nevada and Washoe.

| Table 5-1 Current and Projected Populations of Placer, Nevada, and Washoe Counties | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Locality | 2014 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 |
| Placer County | 357,463 | 371,536 | 391,682 | 415,027 | 442,505 |
| Nevada County | 97,225 | 98,596 | 104,343 | 109,325 | 114,022 |
| Washoe County | 432,324 ¹ | 472,718 | 512,137 | 551,012 | 590,490 |

Notes: ¹ Population estimates for Washoe County are not available for 2014; the most recent population estimates available are from 2013.
 Source: Placer County 2014, Nevada State Demographer 2014, California Department of Finance 2013a, Washoe County 2010

Table 5-2 compares the population estimates for the period 1990 through 2010 for Placer County, its incorporated cities, the Town of Truckee (data not included for 1990 because Truckee was not incorporated until 1993), and California as a whole.

Table 5-2 Population Projections 1990 through 2010

| Locality | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Placer County | 172,796 | 248,399 | 348,432 |
| Auburn | 10,592 | 12,462 | 13,330 |
| Colfax | 1,306 | 1,496 | 1,963 |
| Lincoln | 7,248 | 11,205 | 42,819 |
| Loomis | 5,705 | 6,260 | 6,430 |
| Rocklin | 19,033 | 36,330 | 56,974 |
| Roseville | 44,685 | 79,921 | 118,788 |
| Town of Truckee | -¹ | 13,864 | 16,180 |
| California | 29,760,021 | 33,871,653 | 37,253,956 |

Note: ¹ Data not available for Town of Truckee in 1990 because the town was not incorporated until 1993.

Source: California Department of Finance 2013b

OLYMPIC VALLEY

For the purposes of this EIR, the local setting is based on U.S. Census demographic information provided for the Zip Code Tabulation Area (ZCTA) of 96146. This ZCTA includes the Olympic Valley and Alpine Meadows areas. The ZCTAs are approximate area representations of U.S. Postal Service five-digit ZIP Code service areas that the U.S. Census Bureau creates using whole blocks of present statistical data from censuses and surveys. This ZCTA had a population of approximately 1,366 in 2010. This data indicates an increase of approximately 440 people from 2000 to 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau 2000a). Within the Olympic Valley, the current full-time residential population is 879 (Appendix C).

Squaw Valley consists of a mixture of single-family and multi-family homes, vacation homes, condominiums, timeshares, and resort-oriented temporary lodging including hotels and condo hotels. As a result, the full-time resident population of Squaw Valley is only a portion of the overall daytime and overnight population. Visitors are not accounted for in the Census. Therefore, the functional population of the valley may be greater than indicated by census data, depending on the season and tourism rates.

Placer County estimates that the current maximum overnight peak population of Olympic Valley is approximately 5,858 residents and guests, including existing single- and multi-family residences, as well as existing condo, timeshare, and hotel lodging units. Existing peak guest populations of condominium hotel properties including the Intrawest Village, the Resort at Squaw Creek, and the Squaw Valley Lodge are estimated to contribute a maximum peak overnight population of 2,757 guests. This estimate was developed by applying the occupancy rate assumptions developed in the Water Supply Assessment (WSA; Appendix C), which determined an average population of 1.6 persons per bedroom for managed condo hotel lodging units and 2.0 persons per bedroom in unmanaged condo hotel lodging units. The calculation was based upon a conservatively assumed 100 percent occupancy rate for all lodging units in the rental pool and 100 percent occupancy for all owner-occupied units. The conservative nature of the calculation was increased by multiplying the occupancy estimate by a 1.31 peak factor that was developed from review of peak period overnight guest occupancies (i.e., the factor necessary to get from the average guest population used in the WSA to the peak average observed on August 30, 2014 and December 29 and 30, 2014). Existing timeshare and hotel lodging units including the Olympic Village Inn, PlumpJack Squaw Valley Inn, and the Red Wolf Lodge are estimated to contribute a peak overnight population of 923 guests assuming 100 percent of all rooms/suites are occupied with an average occupancy rate of 4 persons per bedroom and applying the same peak factor of 1.31. The peak population of existing single- and multi-family residences is estimated to be 2,178, based on the number of units reported in the 2010 U.S. Census, plus construction

permits issued between June 2010 and February 5, 2014 (1,037 total units), and assuming 2.1 persons per household. This is a conservative estimate of existing peak overnight population that assumes all available units are 100 percent occupied. Actual overnight peak occupancies are unknown.

5.1.2 Employment

PLACER COUNTY

Table 5-3 provides data related to employment sectors in Placer County from 2001 through 2011. In 2011, Placer County had a total workforce of 126,500 people over the age of 16, an increase of 7,000 workers since 2001, but 13,900 below the peak of 140,400 in 2007 (Placer County 2013). The severe national economic downturn that began in 2008 significantly affected different sectors in Placer County when compared to prior years. The construction and manufacturing sectors saw declines in employment numbers of approximately 44 percent and 38 percent respectively between 2001 and 2011, with much of this decline beginning in 2008. However, at approximately 78 percent, the strongest employment growth from 2001 to 2011 was seen in Placer County's Educational and Health Services sector, which had over 19,000 jobs in 2011. Financial Activities posted the second-highest growth rate in Placer County at around 34 percent followed by the Leisure and Hospitality sector with about 23 percent growth in the ten-year time period (Placer County 2013).

Table 5-3 Employment by Industry in Placer County 2001–2011

| Industry Sector | 2001 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Percent Change 2001-2011 |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------------------------|
| Total, All Industries | 119,500 | 140,100 | 140,400 | 136,900 | 126,300 | 126,200 | 126,500 | 5.90% |
| Agriculture | 400 | 400 | 300 | 400 | 300 | 300 | 400 | 0.00% |
| Mining and Logging | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0.00% |
| Construction | 14,100 | 16,100 | 14,700 | 12,300 | 9,200 | 8,400 | 7,800 | -44.70% |
| Manufacturing | 10,500 | 8,900 | 8,500 | 7,900 | 7,000 | 6,600 | 6,500 | -38.10% |
| Trade, Transportation and Utilities | 23,000 | 28,500 | 29,200 | 27,900 | 26,000 | 25,900 | 26,100 | 13.50% |
| Information | 2,600 | 2,900 | 2,600 | 2,400 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,300 | -11.50% |
| Financial Activities | 7,300 | 11,500 | 11,300 | 10,600 | 10,000 | 9,700 | 9,800 | 34.20% |
| Professional and Business Services | 13,300 | 14,600 | 14,300 | 14,600 | 12,800 | 13,000 | 13,100 | -1.50% |
| Educational and Health Services | 10,800 | 13,900 | 15,800 | 16,700 | 17,100 | 18,100 | 19,200 | 77.80% |
| Leisure and Hospitality | 14,500 | 18,700 | 19,100 | 19,300 | 18,000 | 18,100 | 17,800 | 22.80% |
| Other Services | 4,700 | 4,200 | 4,500 | 4,700 | 4,700 | 4,500 | 4,700 | 0.00% |
| Government | 18,200 | 20,300 | 20,000 | 19,900 | 18,700 | 18,900 | 18,700 | 2.70% |

Source: Placer County 2013

Placer County's 2010 unemployment rate was estimated to be approximately 11.4 percent. However, the economy has been improving and this has resulted in a decrease in the county's unemployment rate as well as throughout the state and country. As of September 2014, the county's unemployment rate was estimated to be 5.8 percent (California Employment Development Department 2014).

OLYMPIC VALLEY

According to the American Community Survey 2008-2012 5-year estimates, ZCTA 96146, which includes the project site, contained 107 establishments that provided 4,132 employee positions in 2012. Approximately

97 percent of workers lived within California and 76 percent lived within Placer County as of 2012. The majority of the employed population of Olympic Valley works at sales and service-related occupations (U.S. Census Bureau 2012).

5.1.3 Housing

PLACER COUNTY

While the county has grown at a rapid pace, much of this growth has occurred within incorporated cities in the western portion of the County. To accommodate population growth, additional housing units have been constructed (Table 5-4). Table 5-4 shows households, average household size, and housing units for unincorporated and incorporated Placer County and the state of California for 1990, 2000, and 2010. The table also shows 1990 to 2000 and 2000 to 2010 absolute growth and average annual growth rates (AAGRs) (Placer County 2014).

Housing units are defined as a house, an apartment, a mobile home or trailer, a group of rooms, or a single room that is occupied and intended as separate living quarters. The person, or group of people, that occupies a housing unit as their usual place of residence comprise a household. The number of households equals the number of occupied housing units. As depicted in Table 5-4, housing units grew at a slower rate than population for unincorporated Placer County between 1990 and 2000, but households grew at a faster rate than population as the average household size decreased. In California, on the other hand, the average household size increased from 1990 to 2000 as population grew faster than the number of households (Placer County 2014).

| Table 5-4 Households, Housing Size, and Housing Units in Placer County and California: 1990, 2000 & 2010 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------|--------|--|--------|--------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Unincorporated Placer County | | | Incorporated Cities within Placer County | | | California | | |
| | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| Households¹ | | | | | | | | | |
| Number | 30,829 | 37,334 | 41,351 | 33,272 | 56,048 | 91,276 | 10,380,856 | 11,502,871 | 12,577,498 |
| Growth from Previous Period | – | 6,505 | 4,017 | – | 22,776 | 35,228 | – | 1,122,015 | 1,074,627 |
| % AAGR from Previous Period | – | 1.90% | 1.00% | – | 5.40% | 5.00% | – | 1.00% | 0.90% |
| Average Household Size | 2.69 | 2.66 | 2.57 | 2.63 | 2.61 | 2.61 | 2.79 | 2.87 | 2.9 |
| Housing Units² | | | | | | | | | |
| Number | 42,507 | 48,433 | 55,891 | 35,372 | 58,869 | 96,757 | 11,182,513 | 12,214,550 | 13,680,081 |
| Growth from Previous Period | – | 5,926 | 7,458 | – | 23,497 | 37,888 | – | 1,032,037 | 1,465,531 |
| % AAGR from Previous Period | – | 1.30% | 1.40% | – | 5.20% | 5.10% | – | 0.90% | 1.10% |
| Notes: AAGR = average annual growth rate | | | | | | | | | |
| ¹ A “household” is a person or group of people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence. | | | | | | | | | |
| ² A “housing unit” is a single-family house, townhouse, mobile home or trailer, apartment, group of rooms, or single room that is occupied as a separate living quarters or, if vacant, is intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. | | | | | | | | | |
| Source: Placer County 2014 | | | | | | | | | |

Placer County’s housing inventory grew at an AAGR of 4.2 percent between 2000 and 2010, which is almost four times the rate of housing unit growth in California as a whole during this period (1.1 percent AAGR). Housing units in the incorporated areas increased at a rate of 5.1 percent, while the number of housing units in the unincorporated areas of the county increased at a much lower rate of 1.4 percent. Countywide, housing units increased at a higher rate than population, and the average household size in unincorporated

Placer County decreased from 2.66 in 2000 to 2.57 in 2010. California's average household size continued to increase over this time period (2.87 in 2000 and 2.90 in 2010) as population grew faster than households and housing units (Placer County 2014).

As of 2010, a total of 152,648 housing units were available in Placer County, approximately 13 percent of which were vacant. These housing units consisted of approximately 80 percent single-family homes, 3 percent mobile homes, and 17 percent multi-family units (Placer County 2013). Housing units in Placer County as of 2013 are estimated to be 155,873, an increase of 3,225 since 2010 (Placer County 2014).

Affordable Housing

Affordable housing refers to housing in which occupants pay no more than 30 percent of their incomes on the rent or mortgage payment. Affordable rental housing programs are typically targeted toward lower income households (those earning less than 80 percent of the area median income), while affordable owner-occupied housing is targeted toward low- or moderate-income households (those earning less than 120 percent of area median income). Based on federal guidelines for 2012, a Placer County family of three earning \$54,850 or less would be defined as low income. Monthly housing expenses of \$1,371 or less would be considered affordable for that household (Placer County 2014).

State law requires each community in California to address its "fair share" of the region's housing needs through its Housing Element. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is responsible for allocating the "fair share" of this total to the counties and cities in the Sacramento region, including Placer County. In allocating each jurisdiction's share of housing, SACOG assessed factors such as job growth, water and sewer capacity, land availability, proximity to transit, and market demand. According to SACOG, between 2013 and 2021, Placer County must provide enough land for a total of 5,031 housing units to be built and affordable at very-low, low, moderate, and above-moderate income levels (Placer County 2014).

OLYMPIC VALLEY

Placer County estimates that there are 1,037 single- and multi-family units, and approximately 1,364 leasable guest rooms and hotel rooms available in Olympic Valley. Squaw Valley Real Estate, LLC owns a dormitory and several apartments within the plan area that are currently used for employee housing and can accommodate housing needs for up to 99 employees on a seasonal basis.

Housing units increased at a rate of 3.88 percent between 2000 and 2010 in ZCTA 96146 (Table 5-5). This is a higher rate of growth than that experienced in the unincorporated county area overall (1.30 percent) during that same period, but less than the growth rate of the incorporated county areas (5.10 percent). The growth rate of households, or occupied housing units, followed a similar trend with an AAGR of 3.80 percent. Although this rate was more than experienced in the unincorporated areas of the county (1.9 percent), it was less than reported for cities in Placer County (5.4 percent).

In 2000, 64 percent of housing units in ZCTA 96146 were specifically intended for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use. In 2010, this figure was reduced to 61 percent of the housing units in ZCTA 96146. The AAGR for housing units specifically intended for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use in ZCTA 96146 was 3.44 percent between 2000 and 2010.

The addition of housing units in the Olympic Valley area between 2000 and 2010 is associated with an increase in the number of households. This may be attributable to both an increase in population and a relatively small household size. Household size in 2010 was less in Olympic Valley (2.29) than in the unincorporated county area overall (2.57) and for the state of California (2.90). The portion of housing units that are intended as vacation properties remained approximately 60 percent.

Table 5-5 Households, Housing Size, and Housing Units in ZCTA 96146: 2000, 2010 & 2013

| | 2000 | 2010 | 2013 (estimate) |
|---|-------|-------|-----------------|
| Households¹ | | | |
| Number | 405 | 588 | - |
| Growth from Previous Period | - | 183 | - |
| % AAGR from Previous Period | - | 3.80% | - |
| Average Household Size | 2.20 | 2.09 | - |
| Housing Units² | | | |
| Number | 1,179 | 1,726 | 1,819 |
| Growth from Previous Period | - | 547 | 93 |
| % AAGR from Previous Period | - | 3.88% | 1.76% |
| Housing Intended for Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use | | | |
| Number | 754 | 1,057 | - |
| Growth from Previous Period | - | 303 | - |
| % AAGR from Previous Period | - | 3.44% | - |

Notes: AAGR = average annual growth rate

¹ A "household" is a person or group of people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence.

² A "housing unit" is defined a single-family house, townhouse, mobile home or trailer, apartment, group of rooms, or single room that is occupied as a separate living quarters or, if vacant, is intended for occupancy as a separate living quarters.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000b, 2010, 2013

5.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.2.1 Federal

There are no federal laws or regulations addressing population, employment, and housing that are relevant to the project.

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 in the setting 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 assigns each regional council of governments a required number of new housing units for that region, including affordable housing. See "Affordable Housing" discussion under Section 5.1, "Environmental Setting," for a description of how this applies to Placer County.

5.2.3 Local

PLACER COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

The *Placer County General Plan (2013)* provides an overall framework for the development of the County and protection of its natural and cultural resources. The Land Use Element contains the following policies that are applicable to the proposed project:

Jobs-Housing Balance

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

The Housing Element includes the county's goals, policies, quantified objectives, and housing programs for the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing. The following policies are applicable to the proposed project:

New Residential Construction

- ▲ **Policy A-5:** The County shall facilitate the development of higher-density multi-family development in locations where adequate infrastructure and public services are available by permitting residential uses in commercial zones, allowing flexible development standards, and providing other incentives.

Housing in the Tahoe Basin

- ▲ **Policy C-2:** The County shall require new development in the Sierra Nevada and Lake Tahoe areas to mitigate potential impacts to employee housing by housing 50 percent of the full-time equivalent employees (FTEE) generated by the development. 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., the physical footprint of the project or an intensification of the use).

Employee housing shall be provided for in one of the following ways:

- Construction of on-site employee housing;
- Construction of off-site employee housing;
- Dedication of land for needed units; and/or
- Payment of an in-lieu fee.

SQUAW VALLEY GENERAL PLAN AND LAND USE ORDINANCE

The SVGPLUO proposes an integrated and balanced set of policies and standards for land development. The plan allows growth in Squaw Valley to reach a seasonal-peak, overnight residential population of about 11,000 to 12,000; maximum skier capacity would be 17,500 people per day.

The SVGPLUO contains the following section (Section 130) related to employee housing (Placer County 1983):

In order to encourage the development of adequate employee housing in all new commercial or multi-residential developments in Squaw Valley, the provisions of this ordinance limiting intensity or density of developments shall not apply to any employee housing units proposed to be constructed in connection with a commercial or multi-residential development. Additionally, the payment of fees required by Section 126 (Road Network Capital Improvement Program) and Sections 19.107 and 19.343 of the Subdivision Ordinance (Park Dedication Fees) shall be waived for any employee housing unit. To be eligible for the incentives provided by this Section, an applicant shall demonstrate that the employee housing units proposed to be constructed are designed to be used solely as employee housing units, and that they are reasonably required by the nature of the development in order to help accommodate the housing needs of employees of the proposed project.

5.3 IMPACTS

5.3.1 Significance Criteria

Based on the Placer County CEQA Checklist and Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact related to population, employment, and housing if it would:

- ▲ induce substantial growth in an area, either directly or indirectly; or
- ▲ displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

5.3.2 Methods and Assumptions

POLICIES PROPOSED IN THE SPECIFIC PLAN THAT COULD AFFECT PROJECT IMPACTS

The following policies from *The Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan* (Squaw Valley Real Estate, LLC 2015) are applicable to the evaluation of population, employment, and housing effects:

- ▲ **Policy HS-1:** Provide affordable housing for a portion of its employees as specified in the Placer County General Plan through one or a combination of the following measures:
 - Construction of on-site employee housing;
 - Construction of off-site employee housing;
 - Dedication of land for needed units; and/or
 - Payment of an in-lieu fee.
- ▲ **Policy HS-2:** The calculation of the number of required employee housing units shall be based on the full time equivalent number of new employees associated with new development under the Specific Plan. In addition, any existing units that are currently used for employee housing and are removed to accommodate new development shall be added to the calculation of units required to be provided within

the phase during which the units are removed. Employee housing units within the Plan Area shall not be counted toward the calculation of maximum density.

- ▲ **Policy HS-3:** Provide incremental employee housing for 50 percent of full time equivalent employees (FTE) generated by the project by the end of the phase during which the job was created. A minimum of 50 percent of the requisite housing will be located within the Olympic Valley.
- ▲ **Policy HS-4:** Where feasible, employee housing shall be located in close proximity to transit and to goods and services needed by the employee population (e.g., grocery stores, restaurants). This will minimize the distances employees must travel by car and alleviate long travel times for employees without vehicles.
- ▲ **Policy HS-6:** Prior to recordation of each small lot tentative map, the applicant shall prepare and the County shall approve, an Employee Housing Plan that describes how the employee housing requirement for that map will be met.
- ▲ **Policy HS-7:** Efforts shall be made to identify affordable housing sites within the Olympic Valley that are obtainable and economically feasible for the developer and convenient for employees. Employee housing may also be located outside of the Olympic Valley.

Additionally, Chapter 8, "Implementation," of the VSVSP includes the following requirement (Squaw Valley Real Estate, LLC 2015) that is applicable to the evaluation of population, employment, and housing effects:

The Draft EIR analyzed a project buildout scenario which assumed that no more than 20 percent of the project would be developed in any single year. Each application for project entitlements shall include a projected timeline for project construction activities, including demolition, site preparation, grading, paving, building construction and architectural coatings. This inventory shall include the projections for construction of any other VSVSP projects that would involve construction activities that are foreseeable to occur concurrent with the project for which the application is submitted, including approved Tentative Small-Lot Subdivision Maps that have not recorded but remain within the valid exercise period and any approved projects not requiring a Small-Lot Tentative Map that are within the valid exercise period. If the total amount of construction in any construction year would exceed 20 percent of the total VSVSP buildout, then the application shall be accompanied by air quality and greenhouse gas analyses to determine if emissions would exceed applicable thresholds in any of the construction years of the project application. If the thresholds are exceeded, additional CEQA review may be required.

IMPACT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

Evaluation of potential population, employment, and housing impacts was based on data obtained from the U.S. Census, the California Department of Finance, and Placer County. The *Placer County General Plan* (2013) and the *Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance* (1983) were additional sources of information on housing and economic conditions as well as on housing policy. Analysis of increased population growth resulting from the project was based on review of the *Village at Squaw Valley Specific Plan* (Squaw Valley Real Estate, LLC 2015) and the WSA prepared for the proposed project (Appendix C). Analysis of employee housing impacts was based on review of the *Conceptual Employee/Workforce Housing Plan* (Appendix D). Existing versus projected increases in population growth were evaluated to determine potential environmental effects associated with project implementation.

Projects can induce growth through both direct and indirect means. Direct growth inducement would result from construction of new housing, which would accommodate new population. Growth may be indirectly induced if implementing a project would create substantial employment opportunities or remove an obstacle to additional growth and development, such as relieving constrained infrastructure and providing more capacity than needed for the project.

This analysis assumes that the project would generate a transient population rather than accommodate new full-time residents in the Valley, because of the manner in which housing would be provided (fractional ownership, seasonal employee housing, etc.). The population of both visitors and employees would fluctuate on an annual, seasonal, and daily basis. As under current conditions, visitors (both day and overnight) would create a combined population that exceeds the resident population of the area as defined in a traditional community planning sense (i.e., the population reported in Census data).

However, a combined visitor and employee population is not officially tabulated, and there is no single methodology for an accurate calculation. Therefore, several assumptions are used to estimate total overnight population, as explained herein. For the purpose of this analysis, the assumptions of the WSA (Appendix C) have been used to estimate population. The quantity of bedrooms or beds was multiplied by an assumed average occupancy rate (e.g., two people per bedroom) that varied according to unit type. Based on the difference between these average occupancy rates and the observed peak average guest population on August 30, and December 29 and 30, 2014, a peaking factor of 1.31 was applied to the average occupancy rates to approximate peak overnight population. The result is a conservative estimate of the peak overnight population during the peak visitation periods, or the maximum number of visitors and employees accommodated by the project. Although there is potential for the overnight population to reach this peak, this would not be the typical overnight population during the peak season, and would exceed the population on a typical night. To reflect the population on a typical night, average annual occupancy rates (i.e., how often each unit is occupied) were developed and applied to the average occupancy rates developed in the WSA. Occupancy rates for units managed by Squaw Valley Resort were based on historical (2009-2012) monthly occupancy rates for existing lodging in Olympic Valley. These occupancy rates were inflated by 5 percent for all months except August, which was inflated by 10 percent, because of new amenities and enhanced lodging operations that are designed to attract more summer visitors. Occupancy rates for privately held units were based on empirical data collected through survey of owners.

5.3.3 Issues or Potential Impacts Not Discussed Further

All population, employment, and housing issues addressed in the significance criteria are evaluated below.

5.3.4 Impact Analysis

Impact 5-1: Induce substantial population growth and housing demand during construction.

The project would generate a temporary increase in employment in Olympic Valley of up to an estimated 136 construction jobs during the most intense year of construction (i.e., when up to 20 percent of total project construction activity is completed in one year). The number of existing construction personnel in the region is sufficient to meet demand associated with the project; therefore, this temporary increase in employment is not expected to generate any substantial new population growth in the area or generate the need for substantial additional housing for construction workers. This impact would be **less than significant**.

As described in Chapter 3, "Project Description," project development would occur over an estimated 25-year buildout period. The sequence and pace for constructing various land uses and facilities would be market driven. However, it is anticipated that during the single most active possible construction year, no more than 20 percent of the total Specific Plan construction activity could occur (see Section 3.4.6, "Project Construction"). Chapter 8, "Implementation," in the Specific Plan (Squaw Valley Real Estate, LLC 2015) supports this limit to peak single year construction activity (see Section 5.3.2, above). Construction activities are anticipated to require up to an estimated total of 136 construction workers during this most intense year of construction. As shown in Table 5-3, according to the latest labor data available (2011), 7,800 residents in the County are employed in the construction industry (Placer County 2013). This existing number of residents in the County who are employed in the construction industry would be sufficient to meet the

demand for construction workers that would be generated by the project. Further, construction employees could originate in other nearby communities in Nevada County, El Dorado County, and from the Reno area. Because construction workers serving the project can be expected to come from an ample available construction labor pool in Placer County and nearby communities, substantial population growth or increases in housing demand in the region as a result of these jobs is not anticipated. Furthermore, even if some construction workers from outside the region were employed at the project site, construction workers typically do not change residences when assigned to a new construction site, and substantial permanent relocation of these workers to the area is not anticipated. Therefore, the project would not be expected to generate the need for substantial additional housing in Olympic Valley during construction. Because of these conditions, the impact related to population growth and housing demand associated with project construction would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Impact 5-2: Induce substantial population growth and housing demand during operation.

Development of the proposed project would result in construction of hotels, condo hotels, fractional ownership units, and timeshare units. The project would also include employment opportunities that would require a population increase to meet business demands. However, the types of employment available within the Specific Plan would be primarily seasonal and would not be expected to result in substantial long-term population growth. Thus, the project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to population growth and housing demand during operation.

The Specific Plan proposes the construction of new housing units. As described in Chapter 3, "Project Description," within the main Village area, the Specific Plan allows for a maximum of up to 1,493 bedrooms (within up to 850 units, and not including employee housing) that would include a mixture of hotel, condo hotel, fractional ownership, and timeshare units (see Table 3-1). These types of units would support a tourist-based, transient population. Based on average annual occupancy rate assumptions, this is anticipated to result in an average population of 1,196 project guests (Farr West Engineering et al. 2014). Peak overnight population, assuming full occupancy of all available units, could reach 3,625 guests and employees (based on 1,120 managed bedrooms with an average occupancy of 1.6 persons each and 373 unmanaged bedrooms with an average occupancy of 2.0, each multiplied by a peak factor of 1.31, plus 300 employees residing in provided employee housing).

In addition to population attracted by available housing units, population growth could result from employment opportunities afforded by the project. The project is expected to generate an additional 574 FTE employees annually, many of which would reside in the plan area. While the project includes removal of existing structures in the main Village area (Courtside and Hostel) that provide employee housing for up to 99 staff, it also includes employee housing units (with mainly single beds, and some double beds that could be occupied by couples) on the East Parcel. The East Parcel would accommodate a maximum of 300 employees (the 99 existing employees plus 201 new employees). This would result in an average overnight population increase of 111 individuals, assuming a 55 percent occupancy rate on average for the year.

To comply with *Placer County General Plan* requirements, the project would employ other methods to meet the County employee housing standards, possibly including provision of off-site employee housing (including outside of Olympic Valley), dedication of land for needed units, and/or payment of an in-lieu fee to the County. Thus, implementation of the project would provide, to a large degree, housing for employee-related population growth. In addition, similar to the tourist-based visitors, employee populations would fluctuate throughout the year, and would thus be considered largely transient. Many of these employees may currently reside in the general project area, and may commute to Olympic Valley from an existing residence. Although these employees may add commuter traffic to the area, employment numbers may not directly correlate to population growth. A relatively small number of the overall project-generated FTE employees would be

expected to rent or purchase year-round residences in the project area, primarily consisting of more senior management and operations staff.

Based on Placer County's forecasted development projections, the WSA calculates that the Olympic Valley is anticipated to have 383 new full-time residents and an average transient population of 682 people by 2040, excluding the proposed project (Farr West Engineering et al. 2014). As described above, the project would generate an average population of 1,307 additional individuals (1,196 visitors and 111 staff). The project would, therefore, contribute 55 percent of the combined average population of 2,372 in 2040.

The population increase due to development of lodging and amenities was anticipated in the SVGPLUO. The SVGPLUO allows for development of up to 3,754 bedrooms (within up to 1,877 units) within the plan area. The proposed project includes a maximum of up to 1,493 bedrooms (within up to 850 units) and employee housing, within the plan area, which is less than half of the maximum development potential allowed by the SVGPLUO. At full build out, the project would add an estimated maximum of 3,325 overnight guests plus up to 300 employees within employee housing. Together with the current maximum peak population of Squaw Valley of approximately 5,858, this total population of 9,483 would not exceed the 11,000 to 12,000 peak overnight population planned for in the SVGPLUO. As discussed in Chapter 4, "Land Use and Forest Resources," the project would be consistent with the *Placer County General Plan* and SVGPLUO.

The project would not indirectly induce growth, as it would be developed in locations where there is already access to urban services. With the exception of water supply wells and improvements to the off-site sewer trunk line, utility improvements proposed in association with the project would not provide additional capacity in excess of the requirements of the proposed project. However, the population increase caused by, or attracted to, a new project may result in additional demands for housing, goods, and services.

The project would, therefore, not be expected to directly support substantial population growth because the resort residential units included in the proposed project are designed for short-term, seasonal or transient living, they would generally not provide attractive opportunities to live in the area year-round; and the project employees would generate few year-round new residents and associated demand for housing. The anticipated population growth would be within the assumptions of the SVGPLUO. Although the project would redesign the well field and upgrade the sewer trunk line to accommodate build out of the SVGPLUO, indirect growth is not anticipated because the project would not remove obstacles to additional growth outside of the plan area. In addition, as described in Section 18.4, "Growth Inducing Impacts of the Proposed Project," the project is designed such that economic activity generated by visitors would be largely contained within the commercial components of the project; consequently, induced growth from economic activity, as defined by CEQA, would be more limited than if the project did not include commercial development. Thus, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Impact 5-3: Displace substantial numbers of housing or people.

The project is expected to generate an additional 574 new FTE employees annually. To be consistent with *Placer County General Plan* policies, the project would be required to provide housing for 287 employees (one half of the FTE total). In addition, the project includes removal of existing structures in the main Village area (Courtside and Hostel) that currently provide employee housing for up to 99 staff. With the removal of these existing employee housing facilities, the project would need to provide housing for 386 employees (287 new employees plus 99 replacement housing facilities) to meet the Placer County policy. Under the current illustrative plan, employee housing units (in different bedroom and dormitory configurations) would be constructed on the East Parcel to house a maximum of 300 employees. This would be sufficient to replace the housing for 99 employees removed by the project, but would be less than the required number of beds to meet *Placer County General Plan* policies for new employee housing. Therefore, this impact would be **potentially significant**.

The project is expected to generate an additional 574 new FTE employees annually. The *Placer County General Plan* requires that new development in the Sierra Nevada provide housing for a minimum of 50 percent of the FTE employees generated by a development project. Therefore, the project would be required to provide housing for 287 employees. In addition, the project includes removal of existing structures in the main Village area (Courtside and Hostel) that provide employee housing for up to 99 staff. With the removal of these existing employee housing facilities, the project would need to provide housing for 386 employees to replace all lost capacity and meet the Placer County policy.

Under the current illustrative plan, multiple employee housing units would be constructed on the East Parcel to provide employee housing (see Exhibit 3-6 in Chapter 3, “Project Description”). Anticipated floor plans for the employee housing would consist of 3-story buildings providing studios and dormitories. Proposed layouts for these buildings include: nine bedroom dormitory units that would accommodate 16 employees each (approximately 2,000 square feet), three dormitory units that would each accommodate 20 employees (approximately 2,500 square feet), and six studio units that would accommodate between eight and 16 employees (approximately 300 square feet). The new employee housing units could accommodate from 252 to 300 employees, with the range based on how many couples share the planned studio units. This would be sufficient to replace the housing for 99 employees removed by the proposed project, but would be less than the required number of beds to meet *Placer County General Plan* policies for new employee housing. Therefore, this impact would be **potentially significant**.

Mitigation Measure 5-3: Develop VSVSP Employee/Workforce Housing Plan.

The project applicant shall develop a detailed “VSVSP Employee/Workforce Housing Plan” for Placer County review and approval. Provision of sufficient housing opportunities to accommodate a minimum of half of new FTEs generated by project operation will be assured through a combination of one or more of the following:

- ▲ development of new on-site employee/workforce housing;
- ▲ development/renovation of off-site employee/workforce housing;
- ▲ dedication of sufficient land for needed units; and/or
- ▲ payment of an in-lieu fee.

The designs of applicant-provided on-site and off-site employee/workforce housing shall be reviewed and approved by the County. An approved VSVSP Employee/Workforce Housing Plan shall be approved prior to recordation of each Small Lot Final Map or approval of a building permit for any new-employee generating project that does not require a Small Lot Final Map, whichever occurs first. The VSVSP Employee/Workforce Housing Plan shall provide an accounting of the final number of net new FTE employees expected to be created by the project with identified phasing; the number, locations, and capacity of new employee/workforce housing units to be developed; location and capacity of dedicated land for new employee/workforce housing; in-lieu fees paid to the County; and implementation schedule to ensure that sufficient new housing is available for new employees as project construction is completed and operations begin. The VSVSP Employee/Workforce Housing Plan shall be updated, at the discretion of the County, by the developer concurrent with review and implementation each project or project phase that generates new FTE employees.

Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a **less-than-significant** level because it would ensure that sufficient employee/workforce housing is provided on-site and/or off-site for at least half of the expected new FTE employees generated, consistent with Placer County General Plan Housing Element Policy C-2.

This page intentionally left blank.