

4.12 POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

4.12.1 Introduction

This section addresses the potential impacts of the project with respect to population, employment, and housing. It describes the existing population, employment, and housing characteristics of the project area and off-site improvement areas and identifies applicable federal and state plans, policies, and laws and local plans, policies, and regulations. The analysis evaluates the potential impacts of the project, including cumulative impacts, related to population, employment, and housing.

Changes in the demographics of an area resulting from new development do not necessarily cause direct adverse physical environmental impacts, but they can cause indirect effects, such as increased traffic and increases in ambient noise levels. The EIR prepared for the *Placer County General Plan* noted that a substantial increase in population would not, by itself, create an environmental impact. Rather, the increase in population could have adverse indirect impacts (Placer County 1994:3-19). These indirect impacts are discussed in the various environmental topic sections of this Draft EIR.

Impacts related to displacement of a substantial number of people or housing are not discussed in this section. The project area and off-site improvement areas contain few homes, none of which would be displaced as part of the project. Therefore, there would be no impact related to displacement and this issue is not discussed further.

Additional analysis of potential growth inducement caused by the project is presented in Chapter 5, “Other CEQA Sections,” of this Draft EIR.

Important terms for specific parts of the project are discussed in detail in Section 4.0, “Approach to the Environmental Analysis.” The following brief discussion is intended to remind the reader how those terms are defined and used in the EIR analysis, including this section. “SAP area” refers to the entire SAP area, which includes the PRSP area. “Net SAP area” refers to the portion of the SAP area outside the PRSP area. The “project” encompasses the entirety of the SAP, including the PRSP and all associated off-site improvements. “Project area” refers to the entire area covered by the project. Because the project area is composed of three pieces (the net SAP, the PRSP area, and areas where other off-site infrastructure would support the project), the impact analysis typically is divided into three subsections: “Net SAP Area,” “PRSP Area,” and “Other Supporting Infrastructure.” (“Other Supporting Infrastructure” refers to improvements outside the SAP area and is divided into “Pleasant Grove Retention Facility” and “Off-Site Transportation and Utility Improvements.”) Some required infrastructure improvements are planned outside the PRSP area but still in the SAP area; those improvements are addressed in the “PRSP Area” sections.

As discussed in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” the PRSP land use plan has been slightly revised since circulation of the NOP. Changes primarily relate to increasing the distance between the landfill property and land designated for residential uses, modifying the density of proposed residential areas, reducing the proposed commercial intensity, slightly decreasing the acreage of open space, and increasing the acreage of parks to meet County parkland provision standards. The size of the PRSP area (2,213 acres) has not changed since release of the NOP, and the overall area of development would be nearly identical. Overall, the number of proposed dwelling units in the PRSP area has been reduced from 5,827 units to 5,636 units, a reduction of 191 units. This change in the number of dwelling units results in a change in the anticipated number of new residents from 13,677 to 13,219, a reduction of 458 residents. The change in commercial intensity results in a change in the anticipated number of new jobs from 16,448 to 14,956, a reduction of 1,492 jobs. The revised dwelling unit, population, and jobs numbers are reflected in this section of the Draft EIR.

4.12.2 Environmental Setting

POPULATION

The Sacramento–Roseville–Arden-Arcade Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) includes Sacramento, Placer, El Dorado, and Yolo Counties. Population growth for the MSA is detailed in Table 4.12-1. The Placer County Countywide General Plan Final EIR estimated that the population of the MSA would increase to 2,350,200 by 2010 and 3,560,200 by 2040 (Placer County 1994:2-6). Actual population growth has been less than forecasted in the General Plan EIR.

Table 4.12-1 Sacramento–Roseville–Arden-Arcade Metropolitan Statistical Area Population Data

	1990	2000	2010	2016
Population	1,481,102	1,796,857	2,149,127	2,296,418
Percent change	–	21.3%	19.6%	6.9%

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2000a, 2000b, 2017a

Since 1980, all nearby counties have experienced tremendous growth, with the largest gains generally occurring between 1980 and 1990. Placer County has consistently had the highest percentage of growth, often more than double that of the other nearby counties. Table 4.12-2 charts the population growth and percentages for El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, and Yolo Counties from 1980 through 2016.

Table 4.12-2 Area Population Data

	1980	1990	2000	2010	2016
El Dorado County	85,812	125,995	156,299	181,058	185,625
Percent change	–	46.8%	24.1%	15.8%	2.5%
Placer County	117,247	172,796	248,399	348,494	380,531
Percent change	–	47.4%	43.8%	40.3%	9.2%
Sacramento County	783,381	1,041,219	1,223,499	1,418,742	1,514,460
Percent change	–	32.9%	17.5%	16.0%	6.7%
Sutter County	52,246	64,415	78,930	94,743	96,651
Percent change	–	23.3%	22.5%	20.0%	2.0%
Yolo County	113,374	141,092	168,660	200,850	215,802
Percent change	–	24.4%	19.5%	19.1%	7.4%

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 1990, 2000c, 2017b

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is required to prepare the metropolitan transportation plan (MTP) for the region. The MTP is a comprehensive, long-range plan for the region's multimodal transportation system. SACOG's plan area for the MTP includes El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties, excluding the Tahoe Basin. In developing the MTP, SACOG prepares a land use forecast required to accommodate the regional growth forecast of population, employment, and housing demand. The 2016 MTP includes a forecast of the amount of growth that will occur in SACOG's plan area over a 20-year planning period (2012–2036). The regional growth forecast is based on economic and demographic projections through 2036, adopted and pending land use plans and policies, market and economic considerations, and other state and federal policies and regulations that can affect the location and pace of growth.

As calculated in preparation for the 2016 MTP, the SACOG area is estimated to add more than 800,000 new residents between 2012 and 2036 (Table 4.12-3).

Table 4.12-3 SACOG Regional Growth Forecast

	2008	2012	2020	2036
Population	2,215,044	2,268,138	2,472,567	3,078,772
Increase	-	53,094	204,429	606,205

Source: SACOG 2015: Table 2.1

The 2016 MTP identified a variety of community types in the SAP and PRSP areas, including Established Communities, Developing Communities, Lands Not Identified for Development in the 2016 MTP/Sustainable Communities Strategy by 2036, and Blueprint Growth Footprint (SACOG 2015:2-23). Developing Communities typically are located at the edge of existing urban or suburban development; they are the next increment of urban expansion. The 2016 MTP estimated that approximately 40 percent of the new homes in the region would be built in Developing Communities (SACOG 2015:2-29).

Table 4.12-4 shows the growth since 2000 for Placer County and the three incorporated cities closest to the project area. Although Placer County as a whole shows tremendous growth, the growth rates of Lincoln, Rocklin, and Roseville exceed the countywide growth rate. Thus, a substantial amount of the growth within Placer County has been within the three incorporated cities closest to the project area.

Table 4.12-4 Placer County and City Population Data

	2000	2010	2016
Placer County ¹	248,399	348,494	380,531
Percent change	-	40.3%	9.2%
Lincoln	11,205	42,781	47,030
Percent change	-	281.8%	9.9%
Rocklin	36,330	57,019	62,787
Percent change	-	56.9%	10.1%
Roseville	79,921	118,660	132,671
Percent change	-	48.5%	11.8%

Notes: ¹ Includes all incorporated cities and unincorporated areas within Placer County.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2000d, 2017c; DOF 2017a

The growth rate for Placer County has exceeded that of the MSA, growing by approximately 40 percent between 2000 and 2010. Growth in Placer County between 2010 and 2016 is estimated at just over 9 percent. Growth projections calculated by the California Department of Finance assume continued high rates of growth in Placer County, with an estimated 2035 population of 482,171 and an estimated 2050 population of 551,660 (DOF 2017a), resulting in an additional 171,129 residents between 2016 and 2050.

The project area contains only a few rural residences along East Catlett Road in the western edges of the area. Therefore, population in the project area is extremely low.

EMPLOYMENT

The population growth in the MSA resulted in similar growth in the labor force. In 2000, the labor force of the MSA numbered 910,000 (EDD 2017a). By 2010, the labor force had increased by more than 15 percent to 1,049,800 (EDD 2017a). The estimated labor force in the MSA in 2016 was 1,073,300 (EDD 2017a). Since 1990, the lowest unemployment rate in the MSA occurred in 1999 with an unemployment rate of 4.1 percent. The highest unemployment rate occurred in 2010, with an unemployment rate of 12.4 percent (EDD 2017a).

Placer County (Table 4.12-5) has seen a shift from its original economic dependence on mining, railroad, lumber, and agricultural activities to a more diversified economy emphasizing construction; financial activities; leisure and hospitality; educational and health services; trade, transportation, and utilities; and other services (Center for Strategic Economic Research 2014:39). Placer County is home to many large private-sector employers, including Kaiser Permanente, Hewlett-Packard, Sutter Health, Thunder Valley Casino Resort, and Union Pacific Railroad (Center for Strategic Economic Research 2014:57).

Table 4.12-5 Placer County Employment Data

	2000	2010	2012	2014	2016
Civilian Labor Force	132,200	173,300	174,900	175,800	179,800
Employment	127,400	153,200	158,500	164,800	171,800
Unemployment	4,800	20,100	16,400	11,000	8,000
Unemployment Percent	3.6%	11.6%	9.4%	6.3%	4.4%

Note: Includes all incorporated cities and unincorporated areas within Placer County

Source: EDD 2017b.

The market analysis prepared for the update to the SIA noted that there are more than 230 establishments within the SAP plan area, employing nearly 35,000 people (EPS 2015:53). Thunder Valley Casino Resort is the largest private employer in the SAP plan area with approximately 2,500 employees (Sacramento Business Journal 2017).

HOUSING

Placer County contained 152,648 housing units and 132,627 households in 2010, with a vacancy rate of 13.1 percent (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). In 2010, the average household comprised 2.6 people (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). In 2017, DOF forecasted that Placer County contained 162,489 housing units, with a vacancy rate of 12.7 percent (Table 4.12-6).

Table 4.12-6 Placer County Employment and Housing Characteristics 2017

	Placer County ¹	Lincoln	Rocklin	Roseville
Jobs	175,800	18,200	29,900	63,700
Housing units	162,489	18,798	24,155	52,407
Households	141,902	18,064	22,950	50,194
Vacancy rate	12.7%	4.0%	5.1%	4.2%
Jobs/Housing ratio	1.08	0.97	1.24	1.22

Notes:

¹ Includes all incorporated cities and unincorporated areas within Placer County

Sources: EDD 2017c; DOF 2017b

Jobs/Housing Relationship

The jobs/housing ratio may be quantified as the ratio of the number of dwelling units to the number of jobs in the community or area. The concept of “balance” is based on the assumption that if a community provides housing proportionate to the number of jobs in the community, the majority of residents would have the opportunity to work and reside in the same community. This balance could result in fewer vehicle trips because of the reduced need to commute in or out of the community for employment opportunities. Fewer commute trips could result in reduced effects on roadways and a lower amount of air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions.

The lower the jobs/housing ratio, the fewer number of jobs for residents, resulting in workers commuting out of the area. Conversely, a higher jobs/housing ratio indicates a greater number of jobs, suggesting that workers are commuting into the area. Because each household may include more than one worker, an overall jobs/housing ratio of 1 to 1.5 is generally considered balanced for purposes of minimizing commuting in or out of the community, depending on local conditions and assuming that residents work in their communities. While the Placer County General Plan does not quantitatively specify a preferred jobs/housing ratio, it does include the goal of working towards a balanced jobs/housing ratio. The market analysis prepared for the Sunset Industrial Area Plan update noted that prevailing literature shows that a ratio of 1.5 is ideal (EPS 2015:42). In 2012, the South Placer area had approximately 1.31 jobs for every housing unit, indicating that South Placer should add more employment opportunities to strike a better balance (EPS 2015:42). Table 4.12-6 includes the approximate number of jobs to housing units for all of Placer County as well as the three incorporated cities closest to the project area.

Affordable Housing

“Affordable housing” refers to housing in which low- to moderate-income households pay no more than 30 percent of their incomes on the rent or mortgage payment (HUD 2018a). Affordable rental housing programs typically are targeted toward lower income households (those earning less than 80 percent of the area median income), whereas affordable owner-occupied housing is targeted toward low- or moderate-income households (those earning less than 120 percent of the area median income). Based on 2018 federal income limits, a Placer County family of three earning \$57,700 or less would be defined as low income (HUD 2018b). Monthly housing expenses of \$1,443 or less would be considered affordable for that household. It is estimated that in 2009, nearly 39 percent of unincorporated county households were paying more than 30 percent of their monthly income for housing costs, and nearly 18 percent of households were paying more than 50 percent (Placer County 2013a:34).

State law requires each community in California to address its “fair share” of the region’s housing needs through its housing element. SACOG is responsible for allocating the “fair share” of the total housing units needed to the counties and cities in the Sacramento region, including Placer County. In allocating each jurisdiction’s share of housing, SACOG assesses 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 in the unincorporated areas of the county that are affordable at very low, low, moderate, and above-moderate income levels (Placer County 2013a:62).

The project area contains only a few rural residences along East Catlett Road in the western edges of the area. Therefore, population in the project area is extremely low.

4.12.3 Regulatory Setting

STATE AND FEDERAL

No federal law applies to this discussion of population, employment, and housing.

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, and the housing element is one of seven mandated elements of the general plan. Housing elements address the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community. The *Placer County Housing Element Background Report* identifies the nature and extent of housing needs in the unincorporated areas, and the housing element itself includes goals, policies, and implementation programs for the planning and development of housing.

State law sets out a process for determining each local jurisdiction's fair share of regional housing needs. 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. The council of governments, in turn, allocates the region's share to cities and counties in the region. See the "Affordable Housing" discussion in Section 4.12.2, "Environmental Setting," for a description of how this process applies to Placer County.

LOCAL

Sacramento Area Council of Governments Regional Housing Needs Allocation

In 2012, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Board finalized its 2013-2021 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), a state-required determination of the number of housing units cities and counties must plan for in their housing element updates. The RHNA allocates housing units in each of four income categories to each city and county in the six-county region, including the Tahoe Basin portions in El Dorado and Placer Counties. The region's total housing allocation is 104,970 units for the plan period which covers January 1, 2013 through October 31, 2021 (SACOG 2018). Unincorporated Placer County's allocation is for 5,031 housing units. Following SACOG's adoption of the RHNA, all cities and counties were required to update the housing element of their general plans by October 31, 2013. Accordingly, Placer County updated its housing element in 2013 to reflect its allocation.

It should be noted that SACOG is currently preparing an update to its 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS). The update is required by February 2020 and SACOG is using 2016 base data for preparation of the MTP/SCS. The 2016 base data was not available at the time this Draft EIR was prepared.

Placer County Code

No Placer County codes are relevant to this discussion of population, employment, and housing.

Placer County General Plan

The *Placer County General Plan* was adopted in 1994 and updated in May 2013 (Placer County 2013b). The General Plan provides guidance for the long-term development of Placer County in the form of goals, policies, standards, implementation programs, and quantified objectives (housing element only). The following goals and policies are relevant to the project.

Land Use Element

GOAL 1.B: To provide adequate land in a range of residential densities to accommodate the housing needs of all income groups expected to reside in Placer County.

GOAL 1.M: To work toward a jobs-housing balance.

- ▲ **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.

GOAL 1.N: To maintain a healthy and diverse local economy that meets the present and future employment, shopping, recreational, public safety, and service needs of Placer County residents and to expand the economic base to better serve the needs of residents.

- ▲ **Policy 1.N.2:** The County shall encourage the retention, expansion and development of new businesses, especially those that provide primary wage-earner jobs, by designating adequate land and providing infrastructure in areas where resources and public facilities and services can accommodate employment generators.
- ▲ **Policy 1.N.10:** The County shall support the development of primary wage earner job opportunities in the South Placer area to provide residents an alternative to commuting to Sacramento.
- ▲ **Policy 1.N.11:** The County shall retain undeveloped industrially-zoned land in the unincorporated area for future use.

Housing Element

GOAL A: To provide new housing opportunities to meet the needs of existing and future Placer County residents in all income categories.

- ▲ **Policy A-4:** The County shall encourage innovative subdivision design and a range of housing types within larger-scale development projects to encourage mixed-income communities (e.g., single-family detached homes, second units, duplexes, live-work units).
- ▲ **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.

GOAL B: To encourage construction and maintenance of safe, decent, and sound affordable housing in the county.

- ▲ **Policy B-4:** The County shall require affordable housing that is to be constructed on-site in a new residential project to be dispersed throughout the project to the extent practical given the size of the project and other site constraints.
- ▲ **Policy B-13:** The County currently requires [that] 10 percent of residential units in specific plans be affordable (i.e., 4 percent very-low, 4 percent low, 2 percent moderate). On a case-by-case basis, the County shall consider allowing developers that provide extremely low-income units to reduce the required percentage of other affordable units.

4.12.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Under the Placer County CEQA Checklist and Appendix G, “Environmental Checklist Form,” of the CEQA Guidelines, implementing the project would result in potentially significant population, employment, and housing impacts if it would:

- ▲ Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e., through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

METHODS AND APPROACH

Using the standards of significance presented above, this analysis will focus on the population growth expected from buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas. The total number of new dwelling units under buildout conditions is calculated based on the number of acres of each land use designation and the number of dwelling units assumed per acre permitted by the land use category. Based on the density of the various residential uses, the number of new residents is calculated using generation rates based on housing type. For example, Low-Density Residential (Age Restricted) units are assumed to generate fewer persons per household than High-Density Residential units. The housing and population estimates for the net SAP and PRSP areas are presented in Table 4.12-7 below.

The calculation of new employment opportunities generated by the project is based on applying commonly-used rates of the number of employees per square foot or acre of non-residential development. Employee generation rates vary based on the type of non-residential uses. For example, retail uses would be expected to have more employees per square foot than warehouse uses. Using generation rates for each land use type, the number of expected employees is generated. The number of jobs that would be expected under buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas is shown in Table 4.12-7. It should be noted that while the market analysis indicated that the area could support up to 15,300 jobs by 2035 (EPS 2015:4), the employment generation numbers for the net SAP area are based on the methodology discussed above and reflect buildout conditions. As buildout of the net SAP area would be considerably longer than the 20-year time horizon used in the market analysis, the number of jobs that could be supported according to the market analysis is lower than the number assumed at buildout. Development of employment uses within the project area would be expected to respond to market conditions, so it is likely that the number of jobs generated would be appropriate given market conditions at the time of development.

PROPOSED SUNSET AREA PLAN GOALS AND POLICIES

The SAP includes the following goals and policies related to population, employment, and housing.

GOAL LU/ED-1: Economic Health and Diversity. To maintain a healthy and diverse local economy that meets the present and future employment, public safety, and service needs of Placer County residents and to expand the county's economic base to better serve the needs of residents and local businesses.

- ▲ **Policy LU/ED-1.1: Economic Diversification.** The County shall actively promote the continued diversification of the Sunset Area's economy by encouraging the establishment of a wide range of businesses including manufacturing-based industries compatible with the area's standards, business support services, service industries, electronics, medical, research and development, computer products and software, warehouse and distribution, entertainment industries, tourist recreation industries, and other uses that will further enhance Placer County's economy.
- ▲ **Policy LU/ED-1.2: Business Development, Expansion, and Retention.** The County shall encourage the development, expansion, and retention of businesses in the Sunset Area, especially those that provide primary wage-earner jobs, by designating adequate land and providing infrastructure in areas where resources and public facilities and services can accommodate employment generators.
- ▲ **Policy LU/ED-1.4: Development Standards and Fees.** For projects that provide a substantial economic benefit to the community (e.g., large numbers of primary wage-earner jobs), the County shall consider flexible application of development standards and deferral or reduction of development fees.

GOAL LU/ED-4: Entertainment/Mixed-Use. To support and promote opportunities for growth in regional scale entertainment-oriented and visitor-serving uses.

- ▲ **Policy LU/ED-4.5: Workforce Housing.** The County shall encourage the development of workforce housing to accommodate local employees, particularly housing affordable to service industry workers.

GOAL LU/ED-5: Innovation Center. To leverage the Sunset Area’s regionally unique supply of large footprint development sites to promote opportunities for innovation economy businesses.

- ▲ **Policy LU/ED-5.5: Innovative Residential Uses.** The County shall support integration of innovative residential uses that are close to workplaces to attract and accommodate creative and knowledge-based economy workers and minimize commute times and vehicle trips.

GOAL LU/ED-8: Business Park. To develop a mixture of light industrial and office uses in a campus-like setting as a transition between intensive industrial uses and office and commercial uses.

- ▲ **Policy LU/ED-8.1: Employee-Intensive and Primary Wage-Earning Jobs.** The County shall encourage the establishment of Business Park uses that are employee-intensive and that provide a significant number of primary-wage-earning jobs which provide salaries comparable to the County’s median income level or higher.

GOAL H-1: To ensure housing developments are compatible with non-residential land uses for the safety and well-being of Sunset Area residents.

- ▲ **Policy H-1.1: Workforce and Student Housing.** The County shall encourage the development of housing appropriate for the workforce of the Sunset Area and for students at the California State University, Sacramento–Placer Center.
- ▲ **Policy H-1.2: Appropriate Infrastructure.** The County shall require new housing development to provide infrastructure appropriate for high-density workforce housing and meet County service standards.
- ▲ **Policy H-1.3: Nearby Land Uses.** The County shall support the development of uses that provide ample opportunities for Sunset Area residents to learn, work, recreate, and shop near where they live.
- ▲ **Policy H-1.4: Protect New Residential Uses.** The County shall ensure that new discretionary development is designed to protect residents from the hazards and nuisances of existing industrial uses, including transitional land uses and landscaped buffers.

PROPOSED PLACER RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN OBJECTIVES

- ▲ **Provide a Balanced Land Use Mix:** Provide for a mix of residential and employment generating land uses, which at buildout, can feasibly support the planned public infrastructure, parks, schools, a university, and other public facilities, as well as the project’s planned commercial and employment centers.
- ▲ **Catalyze Development of the Entire Sunset Area:** Create business development opportunities that will catalyze the grander vision of creating a large-scale job center in the Sunset Area Plan, which provides land for a new university and supporting employment center, retail, and residential land uses.
- ▲ **Establish a Major Employment Center:** Create a large-scale job center that supports a wide range of employment opportunities, which implements Placer County’s vision for the Sunset Area by planning for uses that allow research and development, office, retail and commercial, innovation/technology, and light manufacturing uses.
- ▲ **Provide Diverse Housing Opportunities:** Establish places for construction of a diverse array of housing types including single-family homes in conventional and compact development patterns, townhomes, apartments, lofts, active-adult housing, dormitories, faculty housing, and housing in mixed-use buildings.
- ▲ **Meet Regional Housing Needs Allocation:** Aid the County in achieving its obligation to accommodate a percentage of the region’s forecasted population growth, as mandated by the California Department of Housing and Community Development and as directed by the Sacramento Council of Governments, including applicable provisions of Senate Bill 812.

IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact 4.12-1: Population growth from new homes and businesses

Buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas would result in 8,094 new dwelling units for a population growth of 19,314 new residents. Additionally, buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas would generate 55,760 new jobs in the project area. The physical effects resulting from this level of population and employment growth (e.g., traffic generation, air pollutant and GHG emissions, noise, demand for services, construction of utilities and infrastructure) would be substantial. This impact would be **significant**.

During the early visioning phase of the SAP, a market analysis was prepared to inform land uses within the net SAP area. The market analysis suggested that the net SAP area could support up to 15,300 additional jobs by 2035. Following preparation of the net SAP preferred land use alternative, additional analysis was conducted that indicates that the net SAP area could generate up to 40,804 jobs at buildout. The SAP and PRSP include several designations that would generate new residents in the plan areas. Table 4.12-7 shows the number of housing units, new residents, and jobs that would be generated by full buildout of the project.

Table 4.12-7 Project Housing, Population, and Employment at Buildout

	Net SAP Area	PRSP Area	Total
Housing units	2,458	5,636	8,094
Population	6,095	13,219	19,314
Jobs	40,804	14,956	55,760

Data compiled by Ascent Environmental in 2017

Net SAP Area

The net SAP area is largely undeveloped, with areas of industrial and commercial development located mainly in the eastern area. The few residences in the net SAP area are located on rural parcels in the western portion of the plan area. The proposed project would bring new infrastructure to the area, such as public utilities and roads, as well as new residential and commercial land uses. Development of new residential dwelling units would be allowed in the net SAP area in the Entertainment Mixed-Use (EMU), Innovation Center (IC), General Commercial (GC), and Light Industrial (LI). For all of these designations, residential uses would be permitted if ancillary to or supportive of primary use of the site. The location of residential uses in the net SAP area would be subject to General Plan Policy 4.G.11, as amended, and SAP Policy that establish a minimum buffer limit from the WRS� property line. Upon full buildout, the net SAP area would include 2,458 new dwelling units for an estimated population increase of 6,095 new residents. As shown in Table 3-3, the projected 20-year development projection for the SAP area is 320 dwelling units, which would result in approximately 794 new residents in the SAP area by 2038.

The overarching vision for the SAP area includes creating employment opportunities for residents of unincorporated areas as well as local cities. As shown in Table 4.12-7, buildout of the net SAP area would be expected to result in 40,804 new jobs. Looking at the number of new jobs and housing units that would be created at full SAP area buildout, buildout of the net SAP area would provide over 16 jobs for each dwelling unit.

Forecasts for the region, county, and nearby cities anticipate continued growth in the area. As shown in Table 4.12-3, SACOG anticipates an additional 204,429 new residents between 2012 and 2020, and 606,205 additional residents between 2020 and 2036. DOF forecasts estimate that the population of Placer County will grow by 171,129 residents by 2050 (101,640 between 2016 and 2035, and another 69,489 between 2035 and 2050) (DOF 2017a). The *Sunset Industrial Area Plan*, however, did not anticipate residential development in the area; instead, it envisioned industrial and commercial uses that would generate a substantial number of new jobs in west Placer County. The SAP assumes a substantial amount of residential uses that would be ancillary to and supportive of employment uses in the area.

Because implementation of the SAP would add 6,095 new residents to the net SAP area, develop 2,458 new dwelling units, and generate 40,804 new jobs, impacts related to population growth would be significant.

PRSP Area

At full buildout, the PRSP area would include 5,636 dwelling units in a range of densities, with 10 percent deeded affordable (consistent with General Plan Housing Element Policy B-13, which is applicable to all Specific Plans), resulting in a population increase of 13,219. The potential for campus housing on the university site would increase the PRSP's population by up to 5,200 students and faculty/staff. Table 4.12-7 shows that buildout of the PRSP area would generate 14,956 new jobs, which would provide approximately 2.7 jobs per new dwelling unit. Thus, buildout of the PRSP area would have a potentially significant impact related to population growth from new housing and businesses.

Other Supporting Infrastructure

Project implementation would require new or modified infrastructure, including the Pleasant Grove Retention Facility and various other improvements that would be required for buildout of the project. Supporting infrastructure for the net SAP and PRSP areas has been designed to accommodate the needs of the SAP and PRSP and would not include excess capacity to serve development beyond that anticipated from buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas. Because the other supporting infrastructure would not add residents beyond the number already evaluated for full buildout, the off-site improvements would have no impact on population growth.

Conclusion

Buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas would result in 55,760 new jobs, 8,094 new dwelling units, and 19,314 new residents in the project area.

While buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas would add a substantial number of new residents, the anticipated growth is consistent with the Placer County General Plan and SACOG population forecasts for the region. In the PRSP area, 10 percent of housing would be affordable. While the affordability of housing units in the net SAP area is not yet known, development would be required to comply with the County's Housing Element, and the addition of 8,094 housing units within the total SAP area would likely help the County meet its RHNA allocation.

As noted in the Environmental Setting discussion, Placer County has a low jobs-to-housing ratio, meaning that there are more housing units than jobs and that new employment opportunities should be added in the area. Buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas would add more than seven jobs for each dwelling unit, which would contribute to a more balanced jobs-to-housing ratio in Placer County. Based on the 2017 jobs and housing numbers provided in Table 4.12-6, if the proposed project were built out today, it would increase the unincorporated County's jobs-to-housing ratio from 1.08 to 1.36, which is generally considered balanced.

The physical effects of increased population include, but are not limited to, traffic congestion, noise and air pollutant emissions during construction, changes to the existing visual character, and changes to existing hydrology. These physical effects of increased population are discussed throughout this Draft EIR in each environmental section. Chapter 3, "Project Description," of this Draft EIR presents the plans for the necessary utility and roadway infrastructure needed to support the anticipated population growth that would be realized at buildout of the net SAP and PRSP area. Mitigation measures identified throughout this Draft EIR would reduce environmental effects of new development, but would not reduce all to a less-than-significant level. Thus, while population growth itself would not create environmental impacts, the physical actions taken to support the population growth would have effects on the environment.

While the anticipated development of the net SAP and PRSP areas would include a substantial increase in population from existing conditions, local and regional forecasts anticipated population growth in the area. One approach to mitigation, as stated in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15370, is to avoid the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action. Population and employment growth are fundamental to the proposed project. Placer County acknowledges proposing fewer residential units and less commercial, industrial, and other development types would reduce the physical environmental impacts of

the project. However, doing so would fail to meet the County's objectives to provide opportunities for economic innovation, offer housing diversity, improve the jobs-housing balance, catalyze development, establish a major employment center, and other objectives (See Chapter 3, "Project Description," Subsections 3.4.1, "Sunset Area Plan Objectives" and Subsection 3.4.2, "Placer Ranch Specific Plan Objectives"). For this reason, no feasible mitigation is available to fully mitigate the impacts of population and employment growth. The impact would be **significant and unavoidable**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is available.

Impact 4.12-2: Consistency with applicable general plan policies

The project is consistent with the policies of the *Placer County General Plan* relating to population, employment, and housing. This impact would be **less than significant**.

The relevant goals and policies of the Placer County General Plan (Placer County 2013b) regarding population, employment, and housing are included in Section 4.12.3, "Regulatory Setting," earlier in this section.

The net SAP and PRSP areas would provide 55,760 new jobs at buildout, helping the county towards a balance of jobs and housing consistent with Goal 1.M. Development in each area would be phased and would likely include a mix of residential and non-residential uses in each phase, consistent with Policy 1.M.2. The addition of jobs in the area would also be consistent with Goal 1.N, Policy 1.N.2, and Policy 1.N.10. While the SAP would change some previously-anticipated land uses that were part of the Sunset Industrial Area Plan, there would still be a large area of undeveloped land for future industrial uses, consistent with Policy 1.N.11.

Because the project is generally consistent with the applicable General Plan policies as discussed, impacts related to General Plan consistency would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Impact 4.12-3: Cumulative population growth from new homes and businesses

For population, employment, and housing, the cumulative setting includes Placer County and the South Placer region. In this case, that includes unincorporated Placer County; the cities of Lincoln, Rocklin, and Roseville; and areas of adjacent counties. Table 4.12-3 presents the regional growth forecast prepared by SACOG as part of the 2016 MTP. According to SACOG's calculations, approximately 810,634 new residents are expected in the six-county region by 2036. Development of the net SAP and PRSP areas would generate 19,314 new residents at full buildout, which represents 2.4 percent of the SACOG forecast.

There are numerous past, present, and probable future projects that should be considered as part of the cumulative setting because they contribute to the existing conditions against which the proposed project's and each probable future project's environmental effects are compared. Table 4.0-2 lists and describes these projects. Major project close to the project area include City of Lincoln's Village 5 Specific Plan, which would add more than 8,000 new residences and over 4,500,000 sf of commercial uses, and City of Roseville's Amoruso Ranch project with more than 2,800 new residential units and between 476,000 and 766,000 sf of non-residential uses (see Table 4.0-2). Roseville's Creekview Specific Plan and West Roseville Specific Plan are also near the project area and would add 2,011 and 8,792 dwelling units, respectively, as well as office and other non-residential uses (see Table 4.0-2). Other large developments approved farther

from the project site, but within the region, include (to name a few) Lincoln Village 1, Bickford Ranch Specific Plan, Sierra Vista Specific Plan, Regional University, Sierra Vista Specific Plan, Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, Elverta Specific Plan, and Sutter Pointe Specific Plan. (See Table 4.0-2 for a detailed list.) All of these approved plans would develop over 50,000 acres in the region, adding well-over 100,000 residential units and millions of square feet of non-residential building floor area.

Buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas in conjunction with buildout of projects in the area would result in a substantial number of new homes and employment opportunities. Because population growth is driven by new housing units and supported by employment opportunities, significant population growth would be expected under cumulative conditions.

Table 4.12-6 calculates the jobs/housing ratio for three incorporated cities close to the project area, as well as the overall ratio for the entire Placer County. The City of Lincoln showed a jobs/housing ratio of 0.97 in 2017, meaning that there are more residents than jobs available in Lincoln. While Rocklin and Roseville have ratios of 1.24 and 1.22, respectively, the overall ratio for the whole of Placer County is 1.08. Looking strictly at the numbers for buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas, the project would add substantially more jobs than housing units, making it a “jobs-rich” area. Viewed in the context of all of Placer County, the project’s contribution would serve to provide more balance to Placer County.

While buildout of the net SAP and PRSP areas would have a modest contribution to overall regional population projections, buildout would have a considerable contribution to population growth. For the reasons discussed in Impact 4.12-1, no mitigation is available to reduce this impact. Thus, the project would have a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact. This is a **significant and unavoidable** impact.

This page intentionally left blank.